# THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

*Published quarterly by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools*

Volume IV AUGUST, 1940 Number 3

BOARD OF PUBLICATION

M. R. HINSON, President of the Southern Association
*Professor of Education, Florida State College for Women*

SHELTON PHELPS, Secretary of the Southern Association
*President, Winthrop College*

C. C. SHERROD, Secretary of Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
*President, Johnson City State Teachers College*

FRANK C. JENKINS, Secretary of Commission on Secondary Schools
*Director, Southern Association Study in Secondary Schools and Colleges*

LAWRENCE G. DERTHICK, Secretary of Commission on Curricular Problems and Research
*Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Nashville, Tennessee*

EDITOR

HOLLAND HOLTON, *Professor of Education, Duke University*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Professor Hinson, President Phelps, Professor Holton

Reference to the minutes of the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held in Richmond, Virginia, December 3, 4, 1936, as recorded on page 24 of Volume I, Number 1 shows the following official action authorizing this publication.

> Upon recommendation of the Executive Committee the Association voted to adopt the report of the Committee on Publications appointed at the fortieth annual meeting.
>
> The Committee on Publications of the Southern Association unanimously submits the following recommendations:
>
> 1. That a Southern Association Quarterly be issued.
>
> 2. That a board of five members be held responsible for securing an editor and supervising all matters pertaining to the publication and distribution of the Quarterly. This board is to be composed of the secretaries of the three commissions, the president and the secretary-treasurer of the Association.
>
> 3, 4. (These sections recommended as to the character of the four issues and made appropriation for publication. See page cited above.)

In accordance with these resolutions the Board of Publication as listed above was set up the editor elected, and the editorial committee constituted to consist of the President and the Secretary of the Association acting with the editor.

THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

Volume IV AUGUST, 1940 Number 3

# Dr. Charles Allen Brown, A Tribute*

By L. Frazer Banks
*Assistant Superintendent, Birmingham Public Schools*

It is fitting that the members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools pay tribute to the memory of Dr. Charles Allen Brown. For over twenty years he served this Association officially. His work was in such capacities as member of the Commission on Higher Institutions, of the Committee on Triennial Reports, of the Committee on the Birmingham-Southern Experiment, of the Executive Committee of the Association, and also as President of the Association.

In all of these connections he rendered exceptionally fine service. He accepted responsibility and conscientiously performed his duties. His work in the Association, however, went beyond this, for he was not only a tower of strength in defense of the things for which the Association stands, but also a constructive force in helping to adapt the work of the Association to meet better the needs of the changing educational problems of our section of the country.

In his own state of Alabama Dr. Brown received recognition by serving as president of various educational groups, including the Alabama Education Association, and by his membership on the State Board for Vocational Education and on the Board of Trustees of Howard College.

Except for some summer school work, all of his teaching was in the Public Schools of Birmingham, where he went on his graduation from Alabama Polytechnic Institute in 1893. The Birmingham Board of Education said: "Through forty-six years of distinguished and continuous service in our schools, Dr. Brown has made a most valuable contribution to the upbuilding of this community and has endeared himself to the members of the Board of Education, his associates, the pupils of the schools, and thousands of our citizens—all of whom numbered him as a personal friend."

A most understanding tribute to Dr. Brown was made as an editorial in the *Birmingham News* just a few days after his death in July, 1939. While like other editorials of that paper it was unsigned, it was evidently written by a former student of his who is now himself a teacher, lecturer, and writer of distinction.

* Delivered before the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

"In one of his numerous plays, George Bernard Shaw has a character say: 'I am not a teacher; only a fellow traveler of whom you asked the way. I pointed ahead—ahead of myself as well as of you.'

"Something of that philosophy was a guiding light to Dr. Charles A. Brown, for whom death has just closed forty-six years of service to education in Birmingham. A quiet and a modest man was Dr. Brown. Never did he seek the limelight, never did he appear in public but what it was obvious that his work came first.

"Dr. Brown was an efficient administrator of the high schools of the city in his position as associate superintendent of city schools. But he worked quietly, and by suggestion. Like the teachers and the lowliest pupil, he was only a fellow traveler along the road to learning.

"He taught, as all good teachers do, by example as well as by word. He taught that character was also a process of education. And he taught that sermons were to be found in flowers and running brooks. He taught these things by living them.

"Because he did well his work here, he was honored by the educational bodies of larger interests. But he was never a militant leader. He was ever a fellow traveler, pointing out to himself as well as to others the way of a deep and an abiding education."

It is fitting that the members of this Association pay tribute to the memory of Dr. Charles A. Brown, our friend and fellow worker, who through our Association and in other ways did such splendid work for young people.

# In Memoriam

## JAMES HAMPTON KIRKLAND, 1859-1939*

By SPENCER J. MCCALLIE
*Headmaster, The McCallie School, Chattanooga, Tennessee*

In the brief time allotted to me, it is impossible to give even the barest essentials of the life of a man so brilliant an educator, so constructive an administrator, so creative a promoter and organizer, that I must omit many important facts for facts even more important. James Hampton Kirkland was born at Spartanburg, South Carolina, September 9, 1859, a son of a Methodist minister. I take pleasure in bringing out the fact that he was the son of a preacher, for I too am a son of a preacher, and I have become sensitive over the criticisms launched against our group. It is a great relief to me to mention the fact in regard to one who has made supremely good. In my remarks, I shall refer to him as the Chancellor, for that was the title all of us best knew him by. He had a dozen or more doctor's degrees, one earned from University of Leipzig, and many honorary granted by colleges from every section of the United States in appreciation of his outstanding services in the field of education. But if any one had called him Dr. Kirkland, it would have sounded strange to all of us, and I, at least, would not have recognized who was meant.

If the Chancellor had done nothing else save take the headship of an obscure college and make out of it a great university, that alone would have stamped him as a great administrator and that alone would insure him fame. In 1886, the Chancellor came to Vanderbilt when only twenty-seven years of age to head the Department of Latin. In 1893, he was chosen by the Board of Trust to be Chancellor, in which position he was eminently successful for the remarkable period of forty-four years. From 1937 until his death in August, 1939, he was Chancellor Emeritus. Others in this Association have spoken most eloquently on the Chancellor's record as the head of Vanderbilt University. There is nothing that I can add to the tributes paid by Dr. McCain, Dr. Jack, Dr. Mims, and Dr. Carmichael. Their tributes reveal the wonderful achievement of taking a small, struggling college in the shadowy aftermath of reconstruction days and in making that institution a great university comparable to the best of any section.

Perhaps the greatness of this achievement is revealed by the greatness of the Chancellor's vision of what constitutes the ideals of a college president. May I quote from an address delivered by him over thirty years ago?

"To labor constantly for the world with no thought of self, to find indifference and opposition where you ought to have active assistance, to meet crit-

* Delivered before the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

icism with patience, and the open attacks of ignorance without resentment, to plead with others for their own good, to follow sleepless nights with days of incessant toil, to strive continuously without ever attaining—this is to be a college president. But this is only half the truth. To be associated with ambitious youth and highminded men, to live in an atmosphere charged with thoughts of the world's greatest thinkers, to dream of a golden age not in the past but in the future, to have the exalted privilege of striving to make that dream a reality, to build up a great kingdom of material conquest and make daily lives richer and fuller, to spiritualize wealth and convert it into weal, to enrich personal character and elevate all human relationships, to leave the impress of one's life on a great and immortal institution—this, too, is to be a college president!"

I am not here, however, to eulogize James Hampton Kirkland, the executive head of Vanderbilt University, but I am here rather to pay tribute to James Hampton Kirkland, the creator and for many years the guardian director of this Association. To him and to him alone is the credit due for the remarkable growth of the Association. In 1895, this Association was formed at his insistence in this city of Atlanta where we meet today, forty-five years later. Only six of the stronger colleges of this Southland felt able to join together in the creation of the Association. Only two of their representatives then present are now living: I refer to Dr. Edwin Mims and Dr. Henry N. Snyder. It is hard to realize the conditions that the small group meeting here forty-five years ago faced. But I know, you know, that it was the vision, the courage, and the everlasting determination of the Chancellor that was responsible for this Association. Six colleges, no secondary schools, members in 1895; today, 140 colleges and universities, fifty-two junior colleges, and 1,206 secondary schools. In 1895 few, if any, definite standards, no accrediting commissions; today, we have more commissions, more committees, more standards, than . . . I leave my statement unfinished. At least we have enough. The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is as well-organized, as well run, and possesses as devoted a membership as any other educational organization in America. You that sit here before me today know the great good this Association has accomplished and is accomplishing. It is the child of the Chancellor's brain grown to the full stature of manhood, nourished by his guidance. For this creation, we praise him today.

I shall say no more about these two great achievements of the Chancellor, but I do want to talk to you about James Hampton Kirkland, the man. The Chancellor's rigid classical training gave him the ability to use the English language with the greatest discrimination and with the utmost nicety and discernment. The study of semantics is quite popular these days, but the Chancellor was a past master in the meanings of words before the present professors of semantics were born. He was a profound scholar in Latin,

Greek, and German, and taught all of these languages at one time or another. I have often wondered if he would have been as effective as he was if he had confined his training to the modern courses in education and school management.

I remember quite well, as many of you do, our meeting in Birmingham in 1921. The Chancellor was serving for the second time as President of the Association—an honor accorded to no other man. The meeting was surcharged with feeling. Everyone knew that a display of fireworks would take place at the Thursday night banquet. Dr. John E. White, an able and eloquent orator, was to speak as the representative of a large group of denominational colleges, objecting to some of our standards and to our attitude toward non-member institutions. The Chancellor was appointed for the reply. The banquet hall of the Tutwiler Hotel was crowded and all of us were eager to see the fight begin. Dr. White opened with one of the most forceful speeches I have ever listened to, but he ran out of material after ten minutes. From then on to the finish, foam predominated. At the start of his speech, he quoted a story from the life of Kit Carson about an overbold hunter in the Rocky Mountains who met his death by an unwise challenge. The good Doctor said, "He whistled for the grizzly and the grizzly came." It was a clear intimation that the Chancellor had dared him to come to the meeting to present his case and that he had come as had the grizzly—woe to the Chancellor! I shall never forget my feeling of worry and dismay over what I thought was the downfall of the Chancellor. When White finished, the Chancellor replied in a terse speech of mordant wit and condensed logic that completely destroyed Dr. White's position. Then, to make matters a complete triumph, he proceeded to carve the good doctor into mincemeat. The Chancellor never displayed his abilities to a better advantage than he did that night. The ovation rendered to his address was a tribute to his power of clear expression and to his convincing argumentation. Even the presidents of the denominational colleges joined in the praise of the Chancellor's position. All realized that the Chancellor, in holding to the standards and objectives of the Association against all attacks and against all pressure to compromise, was fighting for the best as contrasted with temporizings and weakening conciliations.

I presume that nearly everyone now present in this room was here to witness the Chancellor's greatest fight and his greatest victory in December, 1930. I refer to the famous Mississippi case. The principles of decent academic freedom, teacher tenure, and other factors vital to college administration were at stake. The great power of a political machine was seeking to submerge the institutions of Mississippi and was defying in every respect this Association. It was a critical situation. Many favored compromise, some under pressure even favored submission, but not so the Chancellor! Able speeches were made in defense or in palliation of the machine's actions, but

when the Chancellor finished his masterly defense of the standards of the Association and his fearless and trenchant attack upon the machine, it was evident to all as to the outcome of the vote. Every motion made to defer action or to weaken the resolutions presented was defeated by a large majority. The final outcome was the complete vindication of the Association's determination to resist every attempt at political domination.

Not only was the Chancellor a supreme master of debate, but he was also a master of talks of a lighter vein. His response to the address of welcome at Charleston, South Carolina in 1924 was pungent with wit and humor. I shall never forget his sentence—"As a native of South Carolina and a former resident of Charleston, I used to speak Charlestonese. I am no longer able to speak it, but I still understand it." He was much sought after as an after-dinner speaker, for in addition to wit and humor he possessed excellent terminal facilities.

I have presented to you instances of James Hampton Kirkland fighting for what was clearly right. I shall now mention an unpublished incident in which the Chancellor was fully prepared to deliver an attack when lacking complete knowledge of the case. This happened at the Charleston meeting of 1924. The Chancellor had prepared a paper written in his usual able style, criticising the dismissal of a group of professors from one of the State universities. He read the paper to the Executive Committee, composed of the then President W. D. Hooper of the University of Georgia, Secretary-Treasurer Theodore Jack of Emory University, Dr. W. W. Guth of Goucher College, Dr. A. B. Dinwiddie of Tulane University, Dr. L. T. Baker of the University of South Carolina, and myself. Fortunately, I knew the inside of the case and I also knew that the Chancellor's paper contained statements that inadvertantly hit practices in certain denominational schools that he was not attempting to criticise. It was not easy for me, as a youngster, to oppose the Chancellor, but I knew it had to be done. So I screwed up my courage and said: "Chancellor, if you present that paper on the floor, I shall be compelled to oppose you and I believe I can defeat your effort to have it adopted." Fortunately for both me and for the Chancellor, Dr. Guth had had a bitter experience with one of the discharged professors and he brought fresh evidence to the situation. After a full presentation of what both Guth and I knew, the Chancellor said: "Gentlemen, I shall not present the paper." The paper in question was never mentioned again, and it is my hope that it was destroyed. In this instance, the Chancellor showed greatness in giving way to new evidence.

Out of the flood of memories in reference to the Chancellor that come back to me, I cannot refrain from mentioning a case that illustrates the Chancellor's consideration to a college honestly striving to do a good job but not meeting a technical standard of the Association. In the days before we had Mr. Huntley as Executive Secretary, it was the custom to delegate members

of the Association to inspect colleges. Back in those days, I was given a number of colleges to inspect and evaluate. I shall speak of only one college inspection. I had made a thorough inspection of Milligan College, at least as thoroughly inspection as was made in those days. I made a favorable report to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, but that body took the viewpoint that Milligan did not meet the requirement in reference to endowment. It was freely admitted that Milligan was paying more to its professors than were many nearby colleges, that Milligan's income was greater, that its work and standards were equal in every respect to nearby colleges that were members; but Milligan was depending upon yearly gifts —a fatal practice then, but it may be a good one sooner than we think, as even endowed institutions may find endowments not as "hot" as they once were. When the adverse report of the Commission came to the Executive Committee, I argued for a reversal of the decision—a right clearly reserved to the Executive Committee. The Chancellor agreed with me and spoke eloquently in behalf of Milligan. My motion lost by one vote and later on Dr. R. L. Marquis, a member of the Executive Committee, came to me with the statement that he was sorry that he had not voted with the Chancellor and me. I could relate other instances of the Chancellor's sympathy with institutions doing honest work but unable to meet standards that were not vital. He hated sham and pretense in every form but was always ready to help the sincere.

At another time Rollins College was seeking admission to the Association presenting for consideration some experimentations not then recognized by the Association. The Chancellor voted in favor of accepting Rollins remarking, "We should always welcome intelligently planned experiments."

Allow me to refer back to the Birmingham meeting of 1921. As previously stated, the evening banquet was a hectic affair with everyone on the expectant list. As is frequently our custom, the speakers and distinguished guests were placed at an elevated table facing the common herd. I was one of the herd. Someone at my table immediately noticed that there were thirteen at the head table and that the arrangement was a likeness of Leonardo da Vinci's Last Supper. The arrangement was so remarkable a replica of the Last Supper that I could not but exclaim out loud, as the Chancellor for some reason or another, got up and left the room, "Gentlemen, behold Judas Iscariot is now leaving the room!" Everyone heard me and the laughter that followed was hearty and spontaneous. At the time I had forgotten that some of the Bishops of the Methodist Church were calling the Chancellor "Judas Iscariot." Later on, I felt guilty of a cruel jibe that I had unconsciously made against the Chancellor. He took it with a grin but what he did to me later is not to be made a matter of record. Yes, the Chancellor could take it as well as dish it out,—and could he dish it out!

It is only fair that I tell one incident in which the Chancellor ruined me.

I have forgotten the meeting place, but I do remember opposing the Chancellor on one proposition that was before the Association. I was making a good speech and was gaining many to my side when in a burst of oratory I shouted, "I do not propose to let Chancellor Kirkland think for me!" Instantly the Chancellor retorted out loud, "What a pity! What a pity!" I was through. I was completely sunk. The laughter that followed drowned me and my motion.

The Chancellor loved appreciation just as you and I do. When we met at Forth Worth, Texas, in 1927, the Chancellor was not well and did not attend the meeting. He wrote me a long letter expressing his regret and asking to be remembered to his many friends. There were also in the letter expressions of his appreciation of my many years of close devoted friendship to him. He closed the letter with the request that I present his resignation from all official positions with the Association. I read parts of this letter to the powers that be and I earnestly urged that they use their influence to do the very opposite of what the Chancellor was requesting. The Association responded to our request in a magnificent way. The Chancellor was made President Emeritus of the Association and was made an *ex-officio* member of every committee and every commission of the Association. I sent him a long telegram immediately after this action was taken. That the action was deeply appreciated by the Chancellor was made evident time and time again in later meetings.

I hope these personal reminiscences will bring back to most of you recollections and will show to the younger group here how much we owe to the Chancellor. It is not too much to say that as the Father of this Association he had more to do in advancing Southern Education than any other person.

But let us draw just a little closer to James Hampton Kirkland the man, as contrasted with the educator, administrator, and organizer. Kirkland was a poet and possessed the poet's creative imagination and intense love of beauty. I shall never forget my visits to his flower gardens. How he would expand when he talked of his roses, his gladioli, but above all of his irises. He would become almost lyrical in his descriptions of this or that flower. Wherever these flowers are grown, the name of James Hampton Kirkland is known. Not only was he interested in raising flowers, but he was deeply interested in the creation of new colors, new types, not a few of which he was the creator. With the soul of the poet, he also enjoyed fine music, fine paintings, and everything else that possessed beauty. It was a treat to me to go with him and President Few of Duke to Williamsburg, Virginia, to spend the day there amidst the restorations of Colonial America.

The Chancellor was more than a poet, he was a fisherman. What higher tribute can I pay to him or any man than to call him a piscatorial artist. It was not my pleasure to accompany him on his yearly trips to Canada, but I have it from first hand from Dr. Clarence B. Wallace, President of this

Association in 1906-07, and who is sitting here in this room today, that the Chancellor was a devotee of the rod and reel. I remind my audience that when the Lord chose men to be Apostles, most of them were fishermen. I'll trust a good fisherman anywhere and in any statement—save as to the size of his own catch. The Chancellor was too honest in his expressions to reach the supreme heights of a fisherman's existence. I shall never forget his attempt to tell me about the big muskellunge that he had caught that summer. He was sadly handicapped by limitations of veracity. I fear that as a fisherman the Chancellor had his limits. Certainly he never reached the heights that some here, whom I know too well to call by name, reach. They never allow small matters of accuracy to destroy an artistic creation of their vivid imaginations.

Through Dr. Wallace, whose privilege it was to spend the summer in Canada with the Chancellor, I have it that the Chancellor was a wonderful companion and a most genial host in the home. The picture Dr. Wallace paints of the Chancellor in his own home is indeed beautiful. Like all men of greatness of soul, the Chancellor was extremely gracious and unaffected. He liked nothing better than to sit by the fireside playing chess. At times he played several opponents at once while blindfolded. A good golf player, an excellent quail hunter, and indefatigable fisherman, a lover of flowers, a creator of new species of irises, a dreamer who made his dreams come true, what more could we expect?

Yes, there is another side to James Hampton Kirkland. He was a supremely religious man. His faith was as simple and strong as was his mind clear and unequivocal. He was no doubting Thomas. Like Saint Paul he could truly say: "For I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." Yes, the Chancellor was a sincere believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, but he was more like us Presbyterians than he was a Methodist. He made his own interpretations, he drew his own conclusions and neither boards nor bishops could awe him into submission. I always felt that he would have made a great Calvinist.

Is it any wonder that such a man was a leader of men? Like all leaders he was at times lonely. At times he walked alone, at times he walked against the crowd. Always he was supremely true to his convictions. He, like his Lord, was ready to face his Gethsemane and even his Golgotha. While he was opposed and vilified in the reorganization of Vanderbilt University, while he met bitterness and resistence within this Association, he lived to see the day when peace reigned for him. What a wonderful end! Truly the Chancellor was a great man. I pray God that this Southland may produce more like him. We need them, we can use them.

# Education's Obligations to Democracy*

By Richard Reid
*Editor, The Catholic News, New York City*

In discussing education's obligation to democracy, it is essential that we first determine what democracy is and what it is not. European monarchies no less than European republics assert they are democracies, and some of them can give their claim substantial backing. Countries nearer our own borders, in which what we consider fundamental rights are denied, boast of their democracy. We have seen in this nation the spectacle of organizations linked with the Soviet Republic, the most autocratic dictatorship of a century which will be remembered in history for the dictators strutting across its pages, presenting it as the ideal democracy.

It is not necessary for our purpose to examine at this time these real, pseudo, and spurious democracies. When we speak of the obligation of education to democracy, we mean American democracy, the essence of which is expressed in these words of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Democracy is not new. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Cicero discussed its merits. There were examples of democracy in the ancient world and in the middle ages as well as in modern times. In its original meaning, democracy implied the exercising of authority by the people themselves, as in the Greek city-state or the New England town meeting. This was not the form of government adopted by the founding fathers. They adopted the republican form, representative government. There were property requirements for voting. We can hardly be said to have become what we now know as a democracy until after the changes effected by Jefferson and Jackson—changes that are among the earliest indications that our form of government is not static but dynamic.

We may say, then, that democracy in its form is representative government, in which all citizens may exercise the right of franchise and have the right to offer for public office. The first obligation of education to democracy, it seems to me, is to determine what is the essence of democracy, what are its fundamental principles, and to impress them upon the consciences of the future men and women of the nation.

A rather general impression has been that the essence of democracy is

* An address delivered before the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

political equality. That was the rallying cry of the French Revolution. There is no need to dwell on the appalling inequalities of those days. It was assumed by the people, because they were so assured by their leaders, that if everyone were made equal before the law the differences between the nobles and the masses would soon disappear; that all that was needed for the people to be as prosperous as the nobles was the right to vote on the same basis as they. History has demonstrated that the inequality of noble and peasant of the eighteenth century has not been eliminated by political equality, but has become the inequality of capitalist and laborer: history has demonstrated that political equality is an effect of democratic principles and a protector of democracy rather than its source.

There can be no real democracy without political equality, and that fact must be impressed on our young people, but education has an obligation to teach them that while cherishing political equality as a treasured right, they should not regard it as the essence of democracy, for it alone will never guarantee democracy's continuance. The German people were, theoretically at least, politically free and politically equal when they of their own accord yielded their freedom to a dictator in return for a promise of economic security.

The failure of political equality to realize its objective has transferred the emphasis from political to economic equality. As the French Revolutionists were the prophets of the eighteenth century panacea, so are the Communists the prophets of its twentieth century successor, which assumes that all men would be equal if they possessed the same things, if no one possessed more than another. It places all property in the hands of the state. Classes, it reasons, are based on private property, and if there is no private property there can be no classes. This is the theory not only of Communism but, in essence at least, of Nazism and Fascism as well. All persons are to be made to think alike, act alike, and live alike.

But such economic equality, far from being democracy, is the death of democracy. For there can be no democracy without freedom, and there can be no real freedom without economic freedom. Furthermore, as an eminent student of the subject points out, while such economic equality does away with big bankers, it gives us Red Commissars; it eliminates classes based on wealth and gives us classes based on privilege. Our young people must be taught, therefore, that while there can be no true democracy and no true liberty without an economic guarantee as its support, economic equality alone does not mean democracy and liberty; it may mean slavery.

The Declaration of Independence, however, says that "all men are created equal." If the essence of this liberty is not political equality, even though including it, and if its essence is not economic equality, in what does it consist? What does it mean? This equality obviously does not mean that men are equal in health, in strength, in intelligence, in morals, or in any of the

other numerous ways in which men differ. The equality cannot be in body, or in mind, and yet it can hardly mean equality in anything outside of man. It means equality of the spirit, equality in the possession of immortal souls which, as the Scriptures tell us, God made in His own image and likeness. It is only in the souls of men that men are equal and that men are free.

This is the only principle that is a basis for true freedom and true democracy, for it is the only principle that says to the worker that he is equal to the mightiest of the nation. Without this principle and without the people being made conscious of the fact that in the period beyond this life the most exalted persons of today will have no intrinsic preference over the humblest, there can be no real equality and no real democracy.

The Declaration of Independence not only says that all men are created equal, but that they are endowed with certain "unalienable" rights. The equality attributed to man does not come from law. The French Revolutionists tried to make man politically equal by law, and they failed. The Communists tried to make man economically equal by law, and they failed. The Declaration of Independence did not try to make man equal by law, but recognized that this equality came from man's Maker, and it has not failed. Mussolini asserts that the state is the creator of rights. Hitler maintains that the source of rights is not "the state as an economic organization but a race organism," which means in practice that only Aryans have rights. Stalin's doctrine makes the party the fount of rights. Fascism, Nazism, and Communism in assuming to give or withhold inalienable rights assume a power that belongs to God alone. They all take from man that which belongs to him by nature. The difference between them, it has been well said, is the difference between theft, larceny, and burglary.

The Declaration of Independence, on the other hand, does not presume to give man his inalienable rights. It recognizes that the source of human rights is not a Declaration of Independence or a Constitution or a Parliament or the will of the majority, or a dictator, but God; that the state did not create but is bound to recognize these rights, and that governments exist to protect them.

These spiritual principles, these religious principles if you will, are the only protection against totalitarianism, against the tyranny of the state which has in so many countries made a shambles of human liberty. And only to the extent to which we succeed in permeating the minds and the hearts of our people with them are we guaranteed that democracy as we know it will flourish.

We must impress upon our young people the fact that universal suffrage alone does not necessarily mean freedom. A majority is not as likely to persecute or deprive the body politic of liberty as an aristocracy or an oligarchy or a dictator, but the people unless guided by sound principles can be as tyrannical as any absolute ruler. Unless the people realize the spiritual

basis of freedom, unless they are conscious of the basic equality of mankind, unless they know that man has certain inalienable rights given to him by God, which no majority can take from him, there is no assurance that they will exercise their power in the interests of true democracy and liberty. We have too many instances in history of injustices inflicted on minorities by majorities to believe that the free ballot *per se* is a guarantee of justice and freedom. We know also that last year's minority often becomes this year's majority and *vice versa*, demonstrating the fallibility of human judgment, whether in the individual or *en masse*. Hence the importance of the direction given our democratic movement by the people, and the mighty obligation and opportunity of educators upon whom in the last analysis the informing of the minds and the fashioning of the wills of the men and women of tomorrow depend.

Our young people must be taught that the freedom of democracy is freedom with a purpose. Freedom is not given us by God to do what we will but to do what we ought. Freedom is given us to attain our end in the life to come by the exercising of it in this life. We are free to ignore the moral law if we so will. A man is free to drink to excess, but every time he does it he becomes less free; and finally if he persists, he loses his freedom and becomes a slave to habit. Similarly with other abuses of freedom.

If we are to preserve our freedom, our young people must know that there is no such thing as freedom from law; there is only freedom within law. Too often in these days freedom is interpreted to mean the right to do anything one pleases whether lawfully constituted authority wills it or no, like the misguided young men and women who believe that freedom includes the right to hurl insults at representatives in this country of friendly governments, and who when arrested for disorderly conduct because of the violation of the rights of others their annoying and ill-bred conduct causes complain that they are being denied their constitutional rights. These ill-advised and ill-informed young people do not realize that freedom and authority are not opposites but complements, and that authority, like the Constitution of the United States which is the Magna Carta of our liberties, exists only to protect our liberties.

Although, as we have seen in the case of the totalitarian states, economic equality is not the essence of democracy, there can be no real democracy, no real liberty, no real freedom without economic security. Economic security is and ought to be a fruit of the basic, the fundamental equality of democracy. Man is composed of body and soul, and he is not wholly free unless both his body and his soul are free. And his material self cannot be free without economic security. Man having an inalienable right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," he has a right, subject to the limitations of the rights of others, to the means of sustenance to pursue them. This does not mean that the world owes every man a living, but it means that

a real democracy owes every man an opportunity to earn a living which will sustain him as befitting his dignity as a man. This does not mean that equal goods must be assured each man, because men have varying gifts and incentives. Some men wish wealth, others power, others honor, others intellectual pleasure, others less exalted pleasure, others leisure, and so on indefinitely. The freedom and liberty and equality of true democracy give us a right to be unequal; they give us the right to sacrifice financial return for intellectual pleasure, or honors for leisure. But if democracy as we visualize it is to survive, it must make economic security possible; or the people of this land, as has happened in other lands, may sacrifice their freedom for a promise of such security. Then these United States may become another Germany or Russia. Therefore, in addition to impressing upon our young people a knowledge and understanding of and an enthusiasm for the principles upon which our democracy rests, education can render democracy no greater service than by equipping our young people to achieve the economic security which is a bulwark of our institutions. To do this our educators of course need more than the wisdom of Solomon, more than the wisdom of those into whose hands our affairs are entrusted today. For we have millions of willing young people, able, intelligent, but unable to find employment of any kind or who find only stop-gap employment.

It is a difficult situation, but it should not be disheartening. The nation has faced comparable situations before, and it still lives. There is no shortage of natural resources, there is no dearth of food. There is no lack of skilled labor. The difficulty is one of technique, the technique of distribution, hampered by self-interest in some influential quarters. To despair of the solution of the difficulty is to despair of the initiative and enterprise of our American people and above all to despair of Divine Providence.

Here in the South as well as elsewhere, would it not be helpful to the future economic security of our young people and therefore of democracy if we could impress upon our future graduates a deeper conviction of the great dignity of labor? The Greeks scorned labor; Plato, Aristotle and Xenophon regarded it as degrading. Thebes had a law forbidding a man to be a magistrate until ten years after he had given up business. In Greek city-states only free-men were citizens. In Sparta no citizen could follow any occupation, which in effect made all workers slaves. We have traces of that in countries where the governing aristocracy will not associate socially with those "engaged in trade." We may wonder if that is not an American heritage from the countries of our ancestors, exemplified by the eagerness with which parents strive to make doctors, lawyers, teachers, and members of other professions of all their children. The president of a European college within recent weeks shocked the alumni by saying that many parents would render their children greater service if, instead of spending $5,000 to qualify them for a profession, they bought them farms.

That is a theory to which we cannot subscribe, because we feel that we need educated and trained farmers and other workers, rather than uneducated ones. Particularly does the South need them. We are sending millions of dollars out of the South each year to other parts of the country for agricultural products we can produce here better than the places from which we buy them. Our farms need young people trained not merely in agricultural production methods but in business methods, the methods of packing, selling, distributing.

We see our iron ores, our clays and numerous other raw products being shipped to factories in the North and East, transformed into finished products, and sent back here to be sold in the South at a hundred-fold profit, the money going out of the South forever. In the old days we could sell our cotton in Europe and use that cash to buy these products of the North. Our foreign market for cotton is now largely gone, and we have no cash with which to buy from the North and East except what they give us in return for our products. If the North and East wish to increase business with the South, they must see to it that the South has a source of income to replace that it lost with the decline of foreign markets. They must not only allow but encourage the South to manufacture in increasing quantities the products it is best equipped to manufacture—cotton goods, iron ore products, clay products, tobacco products, and numerous others. With this increased income, the South, which is the North's greatest potential field for increased business, would be able to buy many times as much of the goods which the North and East can best produce—automobiles, radios, watches, jewelry, machinery, paint, etc. The increased employment in the North and in the South would have widespread and profound implications, and none more important than the service it would do democracy through the strengthening of the bulwark of economic security.

Our young people have the native intelligence for this program. That intelligence is being developed in the colleges and schools of the South. What can the educators of the South do to gear this trained intelligence to this problem?

I need not dwell on the necessity of an informed electorate as a bulwark of democracy. By that we do not mean merely a literate electorate. The Germans of the Weimar Republic were literate, but they sacrificed the liberty they had which such as it was was greater than they had ever experienced before, for the mess of pottage which was the promise of economic security. We are told there is no unemployment in the Reich. Neither, says an observer, is there any unemployment in Sing Sing.

The schools of our nation are giving us a literate electorate; our literacy is at least as great as that of any other country in the world. We must not regard it, however, as assuring the perpetuation of our democracy unless it includes not merely familiarity with but enthusiasm for the eternal prin-

ciples upon which the institutions of our nation, the fortresses of our democracy, rest.

With these convictions in the hearts of our people, they will not only protect the liberty and freedom which are characteristic of our conception of democracy, but they will repulse the evils like Communism, Nazism, and Fascism, which threaten it from without, and the totalitarianism, whether from the radicals or reactionaries, which is a danger from within.

There is no place upon which the future of democracy depends more than on the South, because in the South the foreign "isms" have not made the inroads they have made in the great centers of the nation. I am convinced that their power is waning, but it still remains true that the South is most free from them, and therefore best able to battle them. And there is no group in the South upon whom so much depends as on its educators, particularly as represented by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. This indicates the extent of your responsibility and the vastness of your opportunity not only to the South but to the nation and to the civilization which the anti-democratic forces and philosophy threaten. I have only indicated the problems and what seem to me to be the needs; it would be presumptuous for me to suggest methods. I am grateful to you for this opportunity to associate with you; it would have been a privilege to have been merely among those present in the most obscure corner of the convention. May I close by directing to you and to the colleges and schools of the Southland a tribute paid to my own Alma Mater by a president of the United States:

"The defenses of the state are not material but mental and spiritual. Her castles, her fortifications, are her institutions of learning. Those who are admitted to the college campus tread the ramparts of the state. From her hallowed halls are furnished forth knights in armor to defend and extend her liberties. For such high purpose have our institutions of learning come into being—firm foundations of the nation, defenders of justice, teachers of righteous men and women. Long may their turrets continue to rise to show forth the way, the truth and the light."

# The University: A Guardian of Democracy*

By H. M. Gage
*President, Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa*

The American people have three articles of faith. They are faith in religion, faith in education, faith in legislation. Just now we are inclined to believe that faith in legislation is suffering, along with intercollegiate athletics, from over-emphasis and may, therefore, be led to the conclusion that our faith in legislation is a misplaced confidence.

As a matter of fact, our faith is unitary. We have one faith, faith in our improvability, and three principal means of expressing it. Legislation, unsupported by religion and education, becomes a matter of dictation. Babel was a tower built to heaven in defiance of the Eternal. The confusion of tongues in the market place was overcome by one language. This appears to have been an educational achievement. The people were of "one language and one speech." The trouble was not that the people spoke only one language, doubtless a requirement, but that they made only one speech. When the dictator spoke the people reiterated the dictation. In their speech there was no independent thinking such as might have resulted from true education and no exercise of the functions of worship. The people had so demeaned themselves and so dehumanized themselves by submission to dictation that they had become incapable of worship. Worship is one of those picture words, a compound of worth and ship. It is an office and exercise of dignity by which a man declares his worth in the eyes of God and man. Out of worship, so interpreted, grows our faith in religion, education, and legislation. By that faith we have established in America a free church and a free school in a free state.

It is hoped that the foregoing statements may have been sufficient to indicate the place of the University in the guardianship of democracy. The statements can, of course, be reinforced. The president of a great educational institution realizes that he is president of a multiversity and wishes that he could be president of a university. He knows that theology is queen of the sciences but avoids any attempt to establish the queen in her dominion because we are not theologically minded. That may be true. It may also be inappropriate and even offensive to mention the matter in this presence. However, our own feelings and prejudices in this regard, important as they may be, are not for the present supremely important. What is reality? Do we live in cosmos or in chaos? In a universe or in a multiverse? The world's greatest need today is certainly deliverance from multiversity. Split personalities abound. In America we have as many cultural groups developing

* An address delivered before the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

class consciousness as may be found in any country in central Europe. Nations themselves with their independent sovereignties separate atoms acknowledging only arbitrary relations. Isolation is a dream that has no relation to reality. A war goes on in Europe. Theoretically we are not involved. But tobacco orders from England to America to the extent of $100,000,000 have been cancelled. The tobacco farmer is involved. Poland was a principal purchaser of our prunes. The Oregon prune grower is involved. In the realm of spirit is an insistent haunting question to which the answer is perfectly clear. "Who is weak and I am not weak? Who is made to stumble and I burn not?" The terrible illusion of disintegration can be dispelled only by a clear and firm grasp of the principles that account for the integrity of the universe in which we live. Law within and without prevails. Legislatures do not make laws. They express opinions. Sometimes they discover a law and apply it in our statutes. Recognized or unrecognized the law is never broken. It may be defied in ignorance or in bravado; it can never be broken. From the top of a tower rising to heaven as high and defiantly as the tower of Babel I may cast myself to the ground below. So doing I shall break my neck; I shall not break the law. Ignorantly constructed bridges and unprincipled characters cannot stand. The Eternal determines the issue. He is there on the frontiers of creation and at the secret springs of human life. This human race can learn His will and obey and live or it can defy and disobey and die.

These preachments are not gratuitous and impertinent. They proclaim the principles that underlie democracy and its foundations in education. In an age of change, an age distinguished not by the fact of change, but by the rapidity of change and, even more by a universally distributed sense of change, standards are broken down. The immutable disappears. We forget the changeless. First principles, fundamentals, origins, and traditions are held in disrespect or in contempt. We are apt to imagine that every change marks a step in progress toward a definite goal; that the latest is the best and that the newest is the truest, that nothing is fixed, that the North Star in the moral firmament has begun to waver. Forty years or more ago Josiah Royce, writing on "Provincialism: Some Limitations on Thought in America," said: "As a matter of fact what you and I most need is not the new nor yet the old; it is the Eternal. The sincere lover of truth has risen above that essentially trivial opposition between the new and the old. Evolution is only a passing fashion in which the Everlasting appears. For God nothing is new. Be ready then to learn what may be new to you; but avoid this disease of merely running after every idea that loudly proclaims and every plan that stridently asserts 'Behold I am new!' Say to all such claimants to your reverences, 'Are you such that you can grow old and still remain as good as ever. Then indeed I will trust you'."

So admonished it may be well to examine our traditions and the origin

of them. On the ninth of May, 1938, in the Hotel Astor in New York, 1,000 distinguished men and women paid tributes of honor and respect to Thomas Mann. In response he said, "Democracy is nothing but the political name for ideals which Christianity brought into the world as religion. These ideals themselves, whether one indicates them by their political or by their religious names, are threatened today."

Albert Einstein has recently written, "Being a lover of freedom, when the revolution came in Germany, I looked to the universities to defend it, knowing that they had always boasted of their devotion to truth; but no, the universities were immediately silenced. Then I looked to the great editors of the newspapers whose flaming editorials in days gone by had proclaimed their love of freedom, but they, like the universities, were silenced in a few short weeks. Then I looked to the individual writers, who, as literary guides of Germany, had written much and often concerning the place of freedom in modern life; but they, too, were mute. Only the church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for the suppression of truth. I never had any great interest in the church before, but now I feel a great admiration and affection because the church alone has had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual truth and moral freedom. I am forced to confess that what I once despised, I now praise unreservedly."

Our democracy with its institutions of freedom, such as universities and the press by which democracy guards itself, rests upon two great affirmations. They are the foundations of Christendom. There is, first, the affirmation of Godlikeness. As bearers of the divine image all men are equal. There is, second, the affirmation of grace. All men are equal with respect to the fact that they are all possible beneficiaries of the grace of God. By these affirmations democracy was established and proclaimed. Out of them its traditions have developed, its political and educational expressions evolved.

There are urgent and abundant reasons why we should today "remember the rock whence ye are hewn and look unto the hole of the pit whence ye are digged." A rich inheritance, depreciated and threatened as it is today, cannot be preserved and restored in forgetfulness of its origin. The way our ancestors trod was long and hard. Major incidents at the beginning and middle of the way cannot here be recounted. Time forbids. However, I call to your especial rememberance a saying of James Russell Lowell, "Next to that band of refugees whom Moses led out of Egypt, the little company of pilgrims who landed on Plymouth Rock were destined to influence most the history of the world." Why could Lowell say so much? Because they were the vanguard of great colonies going forth into a virgin world to found states built on the principles of self-government.

"What sought they thus afar?
The wealth of seas? The spoils of war?
They sought for faith's pure shrine.
Aye, call it holy ground,
The soil where first they trod;
They left unstained what here they found,
Freedom to worship God."

Now when you study those men, the men of Maryland and Massachusetts, you are impressed, as never before in the study of history, with the ideals which they had, the ideals of men in revolutionary political and social creation, the ideals of men whose eyes had been annointed from above and whose lives were working out the providences of the Eternal. The events of modern history certainly take character according as we relate them in one way and another to the landing of the Mayflower, to that first coming of men to build church and school and state in the New World.

Their ideals found a first political expression in the Declaration of Independence, a second expression in the Constitution of the United States. The Godlikeness of men, affirmed in Scripture, is reaffirmed and given a political expression in the Declaration. Certain endowments, which cannot be denied without the denial of humanity and which in preservation of honor and dignity must be affirmed, have been conferred by the Creator on all men, on men individually, everywhere, and in all ages. Every man counts; no man is negligible. A man just because he is a man has worth on his account, and not merely because of the uses to which he may be put in doing the work of the world. Those distinctly human endowments affirmed in the Declaration and in the Bill of Rights are inherent in man, are not subject to change by majorities, and are affirmations of inalienable individual right against all government and against all men. Of these rights Jefferson wrote that "to violate them would be oppression" and that "rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God," and further "I never could believe that the masses of men were born saddled and bridled and that a privileged few were born booted and spurred to ride them for their own profit by the grace of God."

The Constitution is usually taken for granted. We assume that we know all we need to know about it or that it is too recondite to be understood by ordinary people. Neither assumption is correct. The original seven articles can be read in ten minutes. Many hundreds of volumes have expounded it. Gladstone in perfect description said it was "the most perfect work ever struck off at a given time by the mind and purpose of man." That phrase, "at a given time," indicates the outworking of the long tradition to which I have referred.

The immediate background of this charter of liberty is important. Thirteen colonies along the Atlantic seaboard acknowledged allegiance to England. Each had its own charter or grant of power and plan of government from the English Crown. No one colony was dependent on any other. In the operation of the charters thirteen separate grievances arose. By their grievances the colonies were united in sympathy. Benjamin Franklin attempted to settle all grievances and failed. The Declaration was promulgated. The Revolutionary War followed. In that war there was no real union; there was only George Washington. The Continental Congress had no power to command respect. George Washington had a considerable amount of such power.

In the Treaty of Peace in 1783, the independence of the United States was recognized. For six years following the Treaty the people drifted and quarreled and struggled. Government under the Articles of Confederation was powerless. There were rebellions, riots, and jealousies unrestrained. Chaos and ruin stalked the land. The victory of the Revolution was seriously endangered. Those who had fought for independence and liberty were faced with an over-development of independence and a transformation of liberty,—"freedom free to slay herself." In 1786 a convention called to meet in Annapolis to consider the state of the country failed for lack of attendance. However, Congress succeeded in getting a fair representation of the sovereign states at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787. There met men who, as Thomas Jefferson said, were "demi-gods."

On our coin is inscribed a motto, "*E Pluribus Unum.*" That motto defined the problem of those supermen. Thirteen eggs may be scrambled and out of many we get one. The problem at Philadelphia in 1787 was not so simple. How can thirteen eggs be scrambled so as to preserve the identity of each egg? Their problem was something like that. They solved it by inventing dual citizenship, citizenship in a sovereign state and citizenship in the United States.

Government under the Continental Congress and under the Articles of Confederation had failed for lack of power. So the "demi-gods" in Philadelphia went in search of power. They were at once practical and politically minded. If they had wanted water they would have gone to the ocean. Wanting power they went to the place where power resides. Being democrats they said the people have all the power there is. We shall, therefore, ask the people to give the central government not all but some of the power they have. The Constitution, therefore, as submitted not to the governments of the sovereign states but to the people of the sovereign states, was a request for a grant of some power, not all power, to the federal government. Reluctantly the people, who in fact constitute a state, granted power as requested and reserved all remaining power for themselves with whom it still resides.

The preamble to the document submitted to the people deserves notice. "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure the domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America." Here for the first time in all history is a clear, concise and comprehensive definition of the purposes of good government.

Incidental to our purpose but worthy of note in view of present problems is a letter written by Benjamin Franklin to a friend in Europe. "I send you enclosed the proposed new Federal Constitution for these States. I was engaged four months of last summer in the convention that formed it. It is now sent by Congress to the several states for their confirmation. If it succeeds I do not see why you might not in Europe form a federal union and one grand republic of all its different states and kingdoms, by means of a like convention, for we had many interests to reconcile."

Prior to the adoption of the Constitution the first words of the preamble had no meaning in fact. There had been no "people of the United States"; only people of several sovereign states. What had the people done when they set out to realize the purposes of good government as defined in the preamble and planned in the Constitution? Their achievement is characterized by a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States (Trinity Church, U. S. S. C. 143 : 457), the last day of February, 1893 : "This is a Christian nation." Furthermore, Associate Justice David J. Brewer, United States Supreme Court, in 1902 said, "Still again this is a Christian nation. Not that the people have made it so by any legal enactment or that there exists any established church, but Christian in the sense that the dominant thought and purpose of the nation accords with the great principles taught by the Founder of Christianity. Historically it has developed along the lines of this religion. Its first settlements were in its name, and while anyone is welcome, whether a believer in Christianity or in any other religion or in no religion, yet the principles of Christianity are the foundations of our social and political life. It needs no judicial decision to determine that fact. Indeed the very fact that this State has no established church is one of its highest credentials to the title of Christian nation. The great thought of the Master is that over the human soul is no earthly sovereign."

It is in order now to give some pertinent details of the political expression of the tradition to which Justice Brewer referred. When the makers of the Constitution requested power from the people, they did not request all power, only some power. They did not request and did not get any power over religion and none over education. Religion and education are still reserve powers of the people. In them is more power than in all other powers combined. If a government lacks absolute power over both religion and education, it falls, in essentials of power over human life, far short of being

all-powerful. The people in this country may still determine their own character and so determine the success or failure of their own government. One form of government is not as good as another, and some forms of government cannot possibly express the aspirations of the people. But granted that the form of government is good, the people are comparable to the man at the wheel of an automobile. And, after all, it is the character and intelligence of the man at the wheel more than the make of the car that determines our safety on the highways.

The Constitution was written in fear of government. In it are prohibitions on the power of government over the people. These prohibitions are reflected in charters granted to colleges and universities. Universities as guardians of democracy are a direct inheritance. They are a part of the tradition in which our nation was born. English colleges at Oxford and Cambridge for centuries had operated under royal charters exempting them from exactions and interferences of the Crown. Sometimes these colleges were for and sometimes against the government; always they were staunch guardians of democracy. Without them democracy could not have prospered.

In this country colonists, convinced of the importance of liberty in religion and education, secured royal charters for their colleges—Harvard, Yale, Kings, Queens, Dartmouth, William anl Mary. The validity of these charters under the Constitution was bound to be tested. The test came in 1816 when the legislature of New Hampshire attempted to regulate the affairs of Dartmouth.

"It will be a dangerous, a most dangerous experiment, to hold colleges subject to the rise and fall of parties, and the fluctuations of political opinion. Benefactors will have no certainty of effecting the object of their charity; and learned men will be deterred from devoting themselves to the service of such institutions, from the precarious nature of their offices. Colleges and halls will be deserted by all better spirits, and become a theater for the contentions of politics. Party and faction will be cherished in the places consecrated to piety and learning." Mighty words are these from the lips of Daniel Webster in his argument to the Supreme Court. The thunder of them may be heard over a span of more than one hundred years.

Impressed by Webster, Chief Justice John Marshall rendered a momentous opinion, as timely now as when delivered. "No man ever did or will found a college, believing at the time that an act of incorporation constitutes no security for the institution, whose funds are to be governed and applied, not by the will of the donor, but by the will of the legislature. All such gifts are made in the pleasing, perhaps delusive hope, that the charity will flow forever in the channel which the givers have worked out for it."

Applause today for Daniel Webster and John Marshall. No one who loves our America and understands the centuries-old tradition that gave birth to

her educational institutions can doubt their guardianship of democracy and withhold approval of every present effort for liberty of teaching, self-determination and self-government.

It must be admitted that social controls of education have been increasing and to such an extent that Webster's thunderings and Marshall's deliverances seem to be voices apart from the age in which we live. State legislatures are more reluctant to grant charters to universities and review these charters more frequently. State court decisions, such as the decision holding Berea College subject to the social requirements of the people of Kentucky, reflect trends of modern thought. Nevertheless, education remains a reserve power of the people of the several sovereign states. Fifteen years ago the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth District, refused jurisdiction in a college case on the ground that the college is a part of the commonwealth of the people of a sovereign state and that the beneficiaries of the college, being born and yet unborn generations of boys and girls, must be represented and their rights defended in a court of the state in which the college is located. Twenty years ago in the Oregon and Nebraska cases the United States Supreme Court affirmed the right of groups of people in those states to engage in education with self-determined programs. Under the Constitution these rights cannot be abridged by any state legislature or by the federal government itself.

The perilous state of democracy in the world today and the privileges of democracy in America today can be appreciated only in view of the fact that, save for the United Kingdom and some parts of the British Empire, this country is practically the only country in the world in which such freedom in education as I have described is now enjoyed. It is not found in Germany, Russia, Italy, Spain, China, Japan, India, Mexico, and most of South America. It remains only to be said that rights and privileges that are neither known nor appreciated nor exercised will most certainly be lost.

Acquaintance with the facts of history, knowledge of the mistakes and failures of those who have undertaken the championship of great causes, familiarity with forces and influences that have been potential and inspiring in periods of high achievement in the past guarantee the perpetuation of universities and colleges in the guardianship of our democracy. The value of a past is to get a future out of it. Those who never look back to the past will never be able to look forward to posterity. Happily the future to which we look is not a strange and dreadful something which comes rushing at us from the front. It is a familiar and friendly influence that goes streaming over our heads from behind. "Hitherto Thou has blest us." "Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me." The past is reassuring. Our yesterdays are prophetic.

"What of good the past has had
Remains to make the new time glad."

# Coöperative Study of Uniformity and Reciprocity*

Sponsored by the Southern University Conference and the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
Statement of Progress and Status

By Richard E. Jaggers
*Director, Coöperative Study of Uniformity and Reciprocity*

I. *The first step in the Coöperative Study of Uniformity and Reciprocity was to find out what is the major problem of reciprocal relations, and what are its implications for college enrollments, migrating students, and teacher education standard:*

The constant increase in the number of young people who go outside their home states to attend college, the disposition of and necessity for these young people, often to seek employment in other than their home states, and the necessity for employing agencies within a state to go to other states for persons prepared to do certain kinds of work, make it desirable that unreasonable obstacles to such mobility be removed as far as is possible. The needs of young people in the South are so common and the agencies through which these needs are met have become so standardized that little difficulty should be faced in removing the undesirable obstacles which prevent the flow of trained young people into those professions, trades and occupations which need them and for which their training best fits them.

*The Problem of Student Mobility.*—Young people who attend college outside their home states and educate themselves for the teaching profession often find, when they return home and seek employment in the schools, that they cannot be employed until they return to college and do additional work which will enable them to fit into the training pattern peculiar to the home state. In most instances the philosophy under which they were educated for teaching was the same as that in the home state, and the difference lies in the way the philosophy was expressed in the training pattern. Often, too, there are only minor differences in the actual patterns in the different states through which the training philosophy is expressed. These differences, however, are great enough to send many young people into summer schools after they have been graduated, before they are permitted to teach.

The coöperative study of uniformity and reciprocity shows that the question of reciprocal relations affects the program in all the states. The problem looms in a different light than formerly. For years it was taken for granted that reciprocity concerned only the person from Virginia, for example,

* A paper presented to the Association in connection with the Report of the Joint Committee on Teacher Training of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and the Southern University Conference, W. R. Smithey, Chairman, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

who went into North Carolina to seek a teaching position. His home was in Virginia. He was educated in Virginia but had come into North Carolina to teach. If it was made easy for him to get certificated he would take a teaching job which rightfully belonged to a native North Carolinian. When viewed in this fashion it is little wonder that North Carolina was not anxious to make it easy for a Virginian to come over and take a job which might have been filled by a native teacher. North Carolina would have been right if the problem had been concerned with the migrant teacher who could not find a job at home. But facts brought out in a study made during 1937-38 indicate that the major problem of reciprocal relations is not the migrant teacher but the migrating students who are preparing for teaching; not the person living in Virginia educated in Virginia who goes to North Carolina, but the person who lives in North Carolina and is educated in Virginia and who returns to North Carolina to teach. Eight of the eleven southern states studied had more than 11 per cent of their college enrollments from other states, five had more than 16 per cent of their enrollments from other states, and three had more than 23 per cent of their enrollments from other states.

TABLE I

Summary of Enrollments in 105 Colleges in 11 Southern States with Percentage from Different Areas, 1937-38.

| States in Southern Association | No. Colleges Reporting | Enrollments Home State Enrollment | Enrollments From Other Southern States | Enrollments From All Other States | Total Enrollment | No. States Represented | Per Cent from Other Southern States | Per Cent from All Other States |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 7 | 6,223 | 620 | 196 | 7,039 | 38 | 8.8 | 11.4 |
| Florida | 2 | 2,463 | 85 | 147 | 2,695 | 32 | 3.1 | 8.6 |
| Georgia | 8 | 6,924 | 900 | 251 | 8,075 | 34 | 11.1 | 14.2 |
| Kentucky | 9 | 13,178 | 820 | 858 | 14,856 | 45 | 5.5 | 11.3 |
| Louisiana | 7 | 10,044 | 1,159 | 780 | 11,983 | 45 | 9.6 | 16.2 |
| Mississippi | 7 | 4,555 | 258 | 87 | 4,900 | 32 | 5.2 | 7.0 |
| N. Carolina | 12 | 8,714 | 1,171 | 1,543 | 11,428 | 44 | 10.2 | 23.7 |
| S. Carolina | 11 | 6,548 | 1,103 | 271 | 7,922 | 37 | 13.9 | 17.3 |
| Tennessee | 8 | 8,640 | 3,015 | 1,143 | 12,798 | 46 | 23.5 | 32.4 |
| Texas | 19 | 23,673 | 698 | 1,365 | 25,736 | 46 | 2.7 | 8.0 |
| Virginia | 15 | 8,219 | 2,220 | 3,174 | 13,593 | 48 | 16.2 | 38.8 |

Most of these young people returned to their home states for employment, and many entered teaching.

*Progress in Reciprocal Relations.*—The regional accrediting of colleges and secondary schools has been the most significant agency for the promotion of reciprocal relations. This movement probably has been responsible for the high degree of similarity not only in curricula but also in the methods of administering the certification of teachers. States, however, have copied from one another those features of the programs of certification which seemed to work best, and the general effect has been that statutes and regulations once written have had a tendency to become fixed laws, and laws to a great number of persons are unchangeable and must be followed to the letter.

*Steps in Solving the Problem.*—No state should adjust its certification standards downward or upward solely for the purpose of meeting the needs of migrating teachers; on the other hand the person who meets all the standards maintained by a state for a particular position should be certificated whether he is a native or not. The problem in the main from the standpoint of interest of each state is for the states within an area of common interests to agree upon a common concept as to what constitutes teacher education, to implement this concept into such general patterns of teacher education as will be generally accepted, and to organize and administer the teacher education program so that those who complete the work and return to their home states may be able to work effectively.

II. *The second step was to study systematically the philosophies and practices in the education and certification of teachers as a means of discovering common concepts as a basis of formulating common patterns.*

Beginning with the school year 1937-38 the State Directors of Teacher Training and Certification in the Southern area made up of the states in the Southern Association and Arkansas and West Virginia in the North Central Association began in earnest the task of bringing about desirable uniformity in the education of secondary teachers, and of securing a high degree of reciprocity in the certification of secondary teachers. The work up to the spring of 1939 was reported at the Southern Association in Memphis.

The Memphis report showed that the State Directors of Teacher Training and Certification in thirteen Southern states had agreed upon the criteria to be used in formulating patterns for the education and certification of secondary teachers in the participating states, and had agreed to use these criteria as guides in formulating a general minimum pattern through which their common concept of teacher education might be expressed. The minimum general pattern agreed upon did not represent a major departure from the teacher education concept in the Southern area as a whole. As a matter of fact, the criteria adopted and the minimum general pattern formulated

expressed definitely the philosophy of secondary teacher education throughout the Southland. Study showed that only minor adjustments need be made in each of the several states in order that certification requirements might conform, substantially, to the minimum general pattern which the state directors had tentatively agreed upon.

In formulating the general pattern for implementing the criteria the functional viewpoint was taken. The criteria described the kind of preparation a teacher should have and each phase of the pattern was set up in terms of these criteria. The experiences a prospective teacher should have in understanding the major problems of social life were selected in terms of their contribution to that objective; the experiences a teacher should have in his preparation for the field in which he was going to work were selected not in terms of any vested point of view, but in terms of their contribution to the development of his ability to work in his chosen field; and the experiences in professional education were selected so they would contribute to the understanding of children-learning, of school organization, of curriculum problems, and to the integration of his total preparation through experiences in learning situations. In no case did the state directors specify in their requirements any subject or course which could not show its contribution toward the realization of the collective concept of what teacher education should be.

In presenting their criteria at the Memphis meeting it was the expressed belief of the State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification that, through conferences with their advisory groups, each institution educating teachers in the Southern area may be led to make such minor adjustments in its secondary teacher-education curricula as will enable the entire South to implement the criteria for the education of secondary teachers to such an extent that desirable uniformity may result and the principle of reciprocity may operate to a greater advantage to the migrating students. If full cooperation could be secured, it was thought it would give us a common concept and substantially a common pattern to express this concept.

In presenting the criteria for the education of secondary teachers the State Directors of Teacher Training and Certification recognized five major phases and organized their statement around these phases:

1. The objective of teacher education for secondary schools is to make available leaders in learning who are able to select learning materials, experiences, and activities, and to organize them into learning programs in terms of abilities, aptitudes, interests, and life purposes of young people of secondary school age.
2. There should be provisions for extensive study or for broad general education which offers reasonable guarantee that prospective secondary teachers shall have adequate experience in such areas as English, sci-

ences, social studies, mathematics, languages, fine arts, and health and physical education.

3. There should be provision for intensive study in those teaching areas in which the prospective secondary teacher is interested and for which he has aptitude. In general, provision should be made for intensive preparation in two or three teaching areas.
4. Provision should be made which will offer reasonable assurance that the prospective secondary teacher will have: (a) an understanding of how children learn and the implication of the learning process for secondary pupils; (b) an understanding of the organization of learning program in the secondary school, and a knowledge of the materials and methods suited to the needs of secondary pupils; and (c) opportunity to integrate his education by actual teaching in a secondary school under the guidance of competent teachers.
5. Persons should not be allowed to complete teacher education curricula unless they manifest during their preparation for teaching a genuine interest in teaching as a profession, an understanding of the implications of education as a constructive agency for maintaining our American way of life, capacity for becoming effective leaders of learners of secondary school age, an aptitude for the particular teaching area chosen, satisfactory academic achievement, and adequate general scholarship.

*General Minimum Pattern.*—After the criteria were agreed upon, each regional group had projected a general minimum pattern which that group believed would express in concrete terms what it meant by the criteria, and which could be used as a basis for setting up certification requirements. Only two State Directors failed to participate in the conferences which formulated the patterns. Following the adoption of the criteria and general minimum pattern by each regional group a general conference was held in Cleveland by the combined groups where minor differences in the patterns agreed upon by each region were harmonized. The result was that this general conference, with eleven State Directors or their representatives participating, agreed upon a general minimum pattern for the entire Southern area. The states agreed to work with their advisory committees in adjusting, gradually, their patterns of education and certification for secondary teachers to conform to the principle expressed by the criteria.

When the directors began the formulation of agreements as to certification requirements which might become substantially the pattern for reciprocal relations, they dealt only with the second, third, and fourth criteria we have mentioned, relating, respectively, to general education, to means of preparation, and to professional education. At the 1939 meeting of the Southern Association at Memphis the tentative pattern had been agreed upon but was

not presented for approval to that body. This tentative pattern was as follows:

*General Education.*—Ordinarily general requirements for the baccalaureate degree will satisfy this criterion, and it will be considered that the prospective teacher had met this criterion if he includes in his general education the following:

(1) *English*, 2 years (10-12 semester hours);
(2) *Science*, 2 years (10-12 semester hours);
(3) *Social Science*, 2 years (10-12 semester hours);
(4) *Health, Physical Education and Recreation, and/or Safety*, 4 semester hours.

*Areas of Preparation.*—This criterion will be satisfied if the prospective secondary teacher meets the minimum requirements in the broad fields of concentration as follows:

(1) *English*, 24 semester hours, including American and English literature;
(2) *Foreign Language*, 18 semester hours, based on two high school units;
(3) *Mathematics*, 15 semester hours;
(4) *Social Science*, 27 semester hours, including economics, geography, government, history, and sociology with a minimum of six semester hours in each of American and European history. If the prospective teacher desires certification outside his broad area of concentration for a minor teaching assignment represented by a single subject in science or social science, it may be added if twelve semester hours of credit are offered in biology, chemistry, geography and geology, economics and sociology, history, government and citizenship, and physics;
(5) *Science*, 27 semester hours including biology, chemistry, and physics, and geography and geology when geography or geology is a part of the high school science field.

*Professional Preparation.*—This criterion will be fulfilled if the applicant for a secondary certificate includes in his professional preparation a minimum of eighteen semester hours in education including the following:

(1) At least one course (2-3 semester hours) in educational psychology;
(2) At least two courses (5-6 semester hours) selected from such secondary education courses as principles of secondary education, fundamentals of secondary education, materials and methods in secondary schools, tests and measurements in secondary schools, and the like; and
(3) One year (5-6 semester hours) in methods, observation, participation, and directed teaching in secondary schools.

The philosophy of secondary teacher education, as expressed in the tentative general pattern agreed upon, requires that the teacher during his period of preparation:

(1) Develop an understanding of the major problems of social life.
(2) Have intensive and extensive experiences in those learning areas in which he must work.
(3) Develop the ability to lead young people in their learning experiences through

    (a) Study of child-learning,
    (b) Study of school organization and curriculum, and
    (c) Laboratory experiences in which he may integrate his total educational experiences.

III. *The third step in the Coöperative Study of Uniformity and Reciprocity was to present the tentative pattern to groups responsible for the education and certification of teachers and to make such adjustments as would promote its effectiveness.*

During the school year 1939-40 conferences were held with State Directors of Teacher Training and Certification and their advisory groups, during which time attempt was made to adjust the pattern adopted in January, 1939, to conditions in the various states. In every state visited the spirit of complete coöperation prevailed and each state group gave its earnest cooperation in getting the principle actually to work. Information secured during the 1939-40 study period shows than an applicant for a secondary certificate who completes, substantially, the minimum general pattern agreed upon in the coöperating states can get some kind of a certificate, regular or special, in each of the coöperating states. In those states where he may not get some kind of regular certificate he may be certificated temporarily upon condition that he completes needed requirements within a reasonable time. At least five states have made significant changes in their training programs to meet the minimum general pattern, while in several other states minor changes have been made to promote desirable uniformity.

During 1939-40 a study was made of the time distribution in student teaching. This study shows that the pattern for student teaching agreed upon represents substantially the average practice in the training schools connected with teacher-education institutions in the South.

IV. *The fourth step was to present revised criteria and pattern in the light of experiences.*

*Revised Agreements.*—On January 18-19, 1940, a general working conference of the State Directors of Teacher Training and Certification was held in Atlanta. During this conference the work of the past three years was reviewed. Experiences in implementing the tentative pattern agreed upon

prior to the Memphis 1939 meeting were examined; and discussions revealed three definite needs: (1) The criteria representing the concept of teacher education should be re-stated in the light of experiences; (2) the minimum general pattern should be stated in more liberal terms and in such a way that it may become a more usable agency in administering a program of reciprocal relations; and (3) the obstacles to a better program of reciprocal relations should be listed for study.

TABLE II

The Number of Clock Hours of Directed Teaching Given in 138 Colleges in Eleven States, and the Semester Hours of Credit in Directed Teaching.

| States | Clock Hours in Directed Teaching | | | | Credit Given for Directed Teaching |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Observation | Participation | Teaching | Total | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Arkansas | 29 | 24 | 65 | 118 | 5— |
| Florida | 17 | 15 | 23 | 55 | 3 |
| Georgia | 21 | 22 | 38 | 81 | 5— |
| Kentucky | 24 | 25 | 68 | 117 | 6+ |
| Louisiana | 37 | 39 | 54 | 130 | 6 |
| Mississippi | 48 | 39 | 36 | 123 | 4 |
| North Carolina | 25 | 18 | 40 | 73 | 4+ |
| South Carolina | 53 | 6 | 42 | 100 | 5— |
| Tennessee | 23 | 19 | 40 | 82 | 3— |
| Virginia | 50 | 30 | 90 | 170 | 6 |
| West Virginia | 26 | 15 | 49 | 90 | 5 |

*Statement of Revised Criteria as Adopted.*—It was the belief that the criteria should not be limited to our concept for the education of secondary teachers but should apply to all teachers. The revised criteria are as follows:

1. *Teacher education in a democracy must have a definite objective.* The objective of teacher education is to make available leaders in learning who have (1) an understanding of the purposes and functions of education in our democracy and (2) the ability (a) to guide learners at the different learning levels in the selection of worthwhile activities and experiences, and (b) to aid learners in using their abilities, aptitudes, experiences, and interests toward the achievement of their life purposes.

2. *Teacher education must lead to an understanding of the major problems of social life.* There should be provision in teacher education for broad general knowledge which offers reasonable guarantee that the prospective teacher shall, through extensive study in such areas as language arts, fine arts, practical arts, mathematics, science, social sciences, health, and welfare, acquire an understanding of the major problems of social life and their implications for the learners whom he leads, for his fellow workers, for the parents, and for the public in general.

3. *Teacher education must develop leaders in the major learning areas and learning levels.* There should be provision in teacher education for intensive study of the problems in those teaching areas and learning levels (1) in which the prospective teacher is interested, (2) for which he has aptitudes, and (3) in which there is reasonable promise that he may find employment.

4. *Teacher education must provide for professional integration and orientation.* Provision should be made in teacher education whereby the prospective teacher may employ his knowledge and understandings in learning situations, and to that end his preparation should include (1) understanding of the vital problems in connection with the growth and development of children; (2) an understanding of the organization and control of learning programs in the school; (3) knowledge and understanding of the application of methods and uses of materials suited to the different learning levels; and (4) an opportunity to integrate his own educational experiences by actual teaching under competent guidance.

5. *Teacher education must provide for selection and guidance and for evaluating results.* Teacher education should provide a workable plan of pre-training selection, in-training guidance, and follow-up evaluation to the end that only those persons may be permitted to complete teacher-education curricula who manifest during their preparations (1) physical, emotional, and mental fitness, (2) an appreciation of the science and art of living, (3) a genuine interest in teaching as a profession, (4) an understanding of the implications of education as a constructive agency in maintaining and improving our American way of life, (5) capacity for becoming leaders of learners, (6) an aptitude for the teaching area and school level chosen, (7) satisfactory academic achievement, and (8) adequate general scholarship.

*Revised Minimum General Pattern Adopted.*—In the light of information obtained through conferences during the year, it was decided in the Atlanta conference, January, 1940, that certain changes should be made in the tentative pattern agreed upon prior to the 1939 Memphis meeting. This revised pattern for desirable uniformity in the education of secondary teachers and

reciprocity in the certification of secondary teachers was agreed upon as follows:

1. *The amount and quality of training of an out-of-state applicant for a secondary certificate shall be substantially equivalent to that required for the secondary certificate in the state in which he applies:*

(a) The applicant must meet the minimum requirement for the highest grade secondary certificate issued in his home state.

(b) The applicant shall be graduated with a baccalaureate degree from a four-year college accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, or similar accrediting agency, or from a college recognized by the accrediting authority in the state in which he desires to be certificated.

(c) The applicant shall show by an official transcript that he has completed a curriculum substantially equivalent to that required for the issuance of the high school certificate in the state in which he makes application, which curriculum shall include, substantially, the following:

(1) There shall be a transcript of college work showing that the applicant has a broad general knowledge of the major problems of social life represented by approximately two years of study (10-12 semester hours) each in English, sciences, (mathematics may be included), and social sciences, and four semester hours in health, physical education and safety.

(2) The transcript of college work shall show that the applicant has had adequate preparation in the areas in which he desires to teach; a minimum of 24 semester hours in English, 18 semester hours (based on two high school units) in foreign language, 27 semester hours in science, 27 semester hours in social science, and 15 semester hours in mathematics. (Additional individual subjects may be added to the certificate if the applicant has 12 semester hours in each.)

(3) The transcript of college work shall show that the applicant has had 18 semester hours in education and has (a) an understanding of how children learn and the implications of the learning process for secondary pupils (at least one course in educational psychology), (b) an understanding of the learning programs in the secondary school and a knowledge of the materials and methods suitable to the needs of secondary pupils (two courses relating to organization and curriculum of the secondary school) and (c) an opportunity to integrate his own educational experience by actual teaching in a secondary school under compe-

tent guidance (six semester hours or 90 clock hours in related methods, observation, participation, and directed teaching in a secondary school).

(4.) If an applicant has 15 semester hours in education distributed as in "3" above, he may be issued a temporary certificate, and given one year in which to complete the additional three semester hours; and if the applicant lacks not more than six semester hours in his teaching field or fields and in general education, he may be issued a temporary certificate and given one year in which to complete the additional semester hours.

2. *The work in the college in which education is received should be organized to carry out the spirit of the patterns:*

(a) The six semester-hour course in directed teaching should include a minimum of 90 clock hours in integrated work in methods, observation, participation, and teaching with a minimum of 60 per cent of the time devoted to actual teaching.

(b) Each state in the Southern area should list the colleges which meet the standards set out in these agreements, and which have their teacher education programs organized and conducted according to the spirit of these agreements, and furnish each State Director of Teacher Training and Certification with this list for his guidance in dealing with the problems of reciprocal relations; and this list should be kept up to date.

V. *The fifth step was to list the problems that should be attacked.*

*Obstacles to a Better Program of Reciprocal Relations.*—In order that the South may maintain those gains a continuous Conference on Uniformity and Reciprocity should be maintained. For the next three years this Conference should be as active as the Coöperative Study has been during the years 1937-40, and thereafter a general working conference should be held annually and should continue in session long enough to work out the difficulties which develop between the annual meetings. If the Coöperative Study of Uniformity and Reciprocity is to continue, the following significant problems should have the attention of the Study:

1. The preparation of secondary teachers should embody a five-year program, and the highest level of certification for secondary teachers should be based upon the completion of such a program.
2. The Southern States should work coöperatively in formulating criteria for selecting persons who will enter training for teaching, for guiding persons in training, and for evaluating those criteria.

3. The Southern States should develop a relatively uniform system of teacher accounting.
4. The Southern States should continue to work on the problem of legislation and regulations to the end that undesirable legal obstacles to desirable uniformity may be removed or at least reduced.
5. Institutions educating teachers should employ the criteria agreed upon in adjusting their curricula to meet the needs of the area served.
6. The student-teaching practices should be liberalized, and stabilized in the light of a common concept.
7. The Coöperative Study should be sensitive at all times to the developments and outcomes of the teacher education studies under way within the Southern area.

# The High School as a Training Ground of Democracy*

By Henry H. Hill
*Superintendent of Schools, Lexington, Kentucky*

Before discussing directly the subject assigned I want to indicate certain assumptions which in my opinion underlie any program of training high school students for citizenship in a democracy.

First, training students for democracy is more imperative during the present decade of 1940-50 than at any other time during the past half-century. An industrial society must be a planned and planning society, else there can be only anarchy or dictatorship in a world of machines and mass production. In a democracy the people must share in planning, whereas in a communistic or fascistic society planning is done by a small group of self-appointed autocrats. In an industrial society the individual must know how to make himself count by working with groups, and this presupposes training and a grasp of the rights and responsibilities of a democracy. The individual needs this training and knowledge if he is to avoid the tempting short-cuts to success which have produced Europe's autocracies.

Despite assertions that we are approaching more nearly to dictatorship day by day, I think you will agree with me that in some respects the United States is more democratic than formerly. I refer to the fact that labor, the poor, and the old have today a voice in government hardly dreamed of a century ago. The influence and participation of these groups adds to the necessity for teaching a better understanding and appreciation of the processes of democracy to young and old alike.

The second assumption is that in general people turn to other forms of government only when democracy denies them its traditional rights and privileges. They are not tempted to become communists and fascists so long as democracy is working well. Of the 20,000,000 youth between sixteen and twenty-five, 10,000,000 are in school, 6,000,000 are working, and 4,000,000 are neither in school nor at work. These youth, consciously or unconsciously, want the rights which you and I of an older generation have had: the right to have a job, the right to marry, rear a family, establish a home, and have a small place in the sun. These are rights of what we have called the American way, the American tradition. The recent unattractive scenes in Washington in my opinion represent the radical fringe made possible in part by the frustrated normal desires of 4,000,000 youth, just as in 1932 the Iowa farmer—conservative of conservatives—took his pitchfork to the sheriff who was trying to sell his farm. Only basically unsound conditions provoked

* An address delivered before the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940,

the farmer in 1932 or will turn youth communistic in 1940. In the long run we must provide work for youth, and in the meantime we must give him an understanding of democracy. We must convince youth that democracy is worth some temporary denial of normal privileges. I might add that we adults haven't too much to boast of in our steady insistence upon tenure, civil service, and old age security, without doing more to help youth.

Third, it may be assumed that there are different ways of teaching democracy. I enjoyed, as I am sure you did, reading "Goodbye, Mr. Chips." The picture was even better. On first thought one might conclude that the so-called public schools of England have the answer. On second thought I believe you would agree that Mr. Chips was the secret of success, rather than the school. In other words, after his metamorphosis in middle age, he would have produced certain values in any school. I am emphasizing that there are certain desirable by-products of character, of personal and intellectual growth, which come from certain individuals with little regard to methods used. It is the spirit that makes persons really live. So I believe that in teaching democracy there is no one method or formula that will succeed.

Fourth, it is assumed that in general it is not possible to retain all old values in high school and at the same time add certain new values. The values of a military school and those of an ultra-progressive school are not attainable at the same time with the same students. May I emphasize this seemingly trite statement. For fifty years and more the best horse breeders in the world have been trying to produce a foal which has the speed to win the Belmont Futurity, a speed test for two-year olds, and the Kentucky Derby, a stamina test for three-year olds. They have not yet succeeded. They have crossed the best bloodlines to produce both speed and stamina but they cannot produce a superlative quality of both. So in our high schools we can secure under ideal conditions the classical values so dear to President Hutchins of Chicago or the service station values which the majority of our Southern youth need to earn a living, but we cannot normally secure both values for the same students. Hence if we seriously attempt to train youth for democracy we must *pari passu* divert some thought, time, and energy to this special goal; there will inevitably be certain alleged present values, such as ease of administration and tranquil docility of pupils, lost or impaired. But things equally true are not equally important, nor are certain present values as important as the broad and consuming purpose of producing good citizens for a democracy.

And now more directly to the subject. Is the high school at present a training ground of democracy? How may it become a better training ground?

The staff of the National Policies Commission recently completed visits to some seventy-five of the nation's high schools which seemed to be among those doing the best job in citizenship training. They interviewed groups

of students representing the leaders, the behavior problems, and the forgotten group who come between. They found only a small percentage of students who had a real knowledge of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in a democracy, many more who knew "of the people, by the people, for the people," and many who knew even less. In general they knew more of the rights than of the responsibilities. (I think we all do.) They found schools which used the principle of permitting a little share in many school activities. They found others which used the medieval idea of unlimited authority in a few things. Dr. Howard E. Wilson of Harvard, a staff member, favors the latter policy. Under this method a high school might delegate full responsibility for assembly programs to the students. Naturally some disturbing things might develop, but according to this theory these students would learn the difficulties and problems in a democracy. It would be a real training ground.

The staff members were impressed by the teaching in one school of democracy to ninth grade students. To teach these students the realities of governments the instructor permitted them to operate their class as a miniature Russia and Germany might be operated, even to the secret police. He, the teacher, was the dictator and really dictated. After a few weeks of trial these particular students learned what communism, fascism, and democracy are. In return for the rights of democracy they were more willing to exercise the necessary responsibilities.

Some high schools attempt to train for democracy by providing democratic administration by the superintendent, principals, teachers, and students. I have only commendation for such efforts provided they are realistic and do not merely substitute authority without responsibility for authority with responsibility. There is, however, a pendulum swing from autocracy through the middle position of democracy and on to the opposite extreme of mild anarchy.

It should clarify our thinking to realize that popular election of school board members, policy making by these duly elected boards, and centralization of responsibility in professionally trained school executives is the democratic way. While I abhor as much as you the martinet and the stuffed shirt and deplore the abuses of authority, I would still insist that there has as yet been developed no other tested method of obtaining trained services in a democracy for those governmental functions which require technical training. There are, nevertheless, distinct possibilities in the techniques of democratic administration which should be tried, but always with a patient willingness to develop among faculty members and students a fuller understanding of the responsibilities of such an enterprise, before democratic procedures are tried. Administrators must be willing occasionally to adopt recommendations made by teachers or students if there is to be any democratic administration.

If I were to characterize briefly the work of the thirty-three high schools enlisted in the Southern Association Study, I think I would say that their plan of work or method of attack on their problems is the outstanding feature. Teachers are learning to coöperate with each other and with children in ways not ordinarily possible where orders are always given and executed. Teachers and students should still be held responsible for certain end results in behavior, attitude, and achievement; but the methods should be flexible and founded on respect for human personality. To use one of the newer words of the New Deal era, the mechanics of administration and the curriculum are being *channeled* to permit democratic processes in the business of learning. It still remains to be seen whether these channels will be reinforced with the concrete of a new dogma. For, believe me, a progressive can be and frequently is just as dogmatically positive as the conservative ever was. In all seriousness, however, the better programs of the thirty-three schools show real promise of providing better training grounds of democracy.

We may safely answer that our high schools do serve as a training ground of democracy without feeling that they are succeeding in doing the job as successfully as they should. We may now direct our attention to some suggestions for improvement.

In the first place, I believe our high school faculties need to understand better what a dynamic democracy is. It may be defined simply as a philosophy of living and governing which emphasizes the rights and responsibilities of the individual. According to Justice Felix Frankfurter, government "is the art of making men live together in peace and with reasonable happiness." His definition applies peculiarly to a democracy.

A staff member of the National Policies Commission recently enumerated four rights in a democracy. First, he mentioned the right to health. That community which extends to its citizens the widest diffusion of opportunities for health has a high rank as a functional democratic unit. Second, there is the right to work. A community which offers work to all its citizens under reasonably satisfactory working conditions meets fully one of the rights of democracy. Health and work are not, however, distinguishing rights of a democracy for they are possessed in large degree by citizens of the totalitarian states. The other two rights to be indicated here are peculiar to democracies. The right of free access to information and the right of free speech are two values which are peculiar to democracies.

If our staffs are to understand the rights and processes of democracy they can make an excellent start by attending one of the nine summer conferences which represent an extension of the Southern Association Study. The present decade is one in which most of us are destined to become better informed, more socially sensitive, more inclined to get actively into the analaysis of our problems, or on the other hand become croakers. (I find, it seems to me, an increasing number of "back to normalcy" advocates who want to get out

on a farm or some quiet and secluded place where they can live apart from the disturbing problems of 1940.)

We can do a better job of teaching the ideals and responsibilities of democracy. We have overdone the job of debunking our heroes. We want no return to blind hero worship, but we don't need quite such a vigorous fault-finding attitude towards everything. Let us learn what is wrong but continue to know and love what is right. It is idle to emphasize respect for the individual and at least by indirection to teach disrespect for our leaders, both present and past. One of our Lexington teachers visited a well-known progressive high school. In his report to me he noted several excellencies but one criticism. He said, "The students have no respect for each other, or anything, not even their teachers." If his report is accurate, that school is not preparing adequately for citizenship in a democracy.

To those who ask how we shall teach better the ideals of democracy I suggest the purchase of the script of *On Our Way*, a dramatization of the purposes of a democracy by students and teachers of several suburban high schools in St. Louis at the recent meeting of the American Association of School Administrators. This pageant, with necessary local modifications, will teach more youth and adults to know and love democracy than all the learned editorials and all the invocations of the philosophy of Aristotle and Plato. We need more intelligent emotionalizing of democracy. I doubt if many ever learned to love America through studying the constitution. It must be made to live, it must appeal to the emotions if we are to compete with the isms of Europe.

*The Purposes of Education in American Democracy*, published in 1938 by the National Policies Commission, is an excellent 157-page volume for educational leaders, but *On Our Way* does more to make the four categories of objectives alive and understandable. Self-realization, human relationship, economic efficiency, and civic responsibility are the four categories of objectives. Our leaders should study this volume but all of us should see and hear the pageant which makes them live.

I think in our last two years of high school we can discuss controversial problems more than we do. Academic freedom can become sabotage, but it need not become so. The majority of our Southern high school graduates go from the twelfth grade directly into the adult world. Where will they learn how to discuss controversial problems if not in high school? The life of a democracy may depend upon the ability and willingness of diverse groups to sit down together and reconcile their differences and agree upon a plan of action that suits no group entirely.

Admittedly we should have the able, emotionally stable, sincere teachers to direct such discussion. We can go no further than the community will permit. In my opinion, however, we lazily avoid too many subjects by repeating the cliché that the community will not permit their discussion. I

have referred to the last two years of high school. I do not mean that children will not learn something about controversial problems before that time, but I do happen to agree with the English point of view, that a school should be a place of security for young children. When children in the elementary grades come from homes where there are strains, emotional upsets, and economic insecurity, it seems to me the school, to the extent possible, should make up for this disturbed condition by creating a happy school environment, not by loading on the shoulders of young children the burden of attempting to solve problems we adults cannot solve ourselves. But we err as badly in the later years of school life if we ignore the very questions our students will soon be deciding.

I have already referred to the spirit of democracy. This must permeate the entire school and seems of even greater value, other things being equal, than the exact form of administration. At a discussion in St. Louis the merits of having proctors stationed in the halls to meet people, help direct traffic, and assist in the government of the school seemed to find less approval than to rely simply on the helpful spirit of such students as one might meet. That kind of argument to me is somewhat beside the point that it is the spirit of the school, government as well as pupils, which decides the question of democracy or autocracy. We don't decide that Atlanta is democratic or autocratic because of the presence or absence of traffic policemen. Their attitude of courtesy and helpfulness, and their ability and willingness to enforce reasonably the traffic laws tell us whether democratic government is functioning well in Atlanta in this particular phase.

Right here I want to pay my respects, or lack of respect, to the misguided notion that a strong and efficient government is incompatible with democracy. So long as the rights of majorities and minorities are protected I want our democratic government to be as strong and efficient as possible. Had we lived in European democracies now crushed we surely would realize that it was the weakness and inefficiency of many of these democracies which caused their downfall. In America we must make our popular election machinery function to produce worthwhile results. Popular education must produce citizens who can make it function, those who will accept responsibility and discharge it well. The high schools can be democratically administered without becoming a kind of institution where freedom is confused with license, where youth are so free to do as they please that they please to do nothing.

Will Durant has stated that real character is produced largely through hardship and responsibility. I am thoroughly in favor of modifying our high school programs to suit the needs of the individual students. I am just as much opposed to going to the extreme of not holding each individual responsible for each right he possesses in high school.

In conclusion I believe the perpetuation and progress of free democratic

institutions is the only real justification for compelling all children to attend school for ten years and for forcing every taxpayer to give us part of his money to pay for the public schools. Providing a genuine training ground of democracy is therefore our most compelling reason for existence. So far as this world is concerned it may even hold precedence over religion, for the simple reason that religion itself failed to prevent communistic Russia and Nazi Germany. In the former the Christian religion was crushed, in the latter it is no longer a decisive material factor.

So in America if we would save our precious rights of religious freedom, we must first save the democracy which permits it. I am not interested in a government which denies religious freedom nor in a religion which denies human rights. As President Roosevelt said recently, these two primary values, religion and human rights, have been closely associated in America since its founding. May we as the leaders of the high schools and colleges do our part to see that we first, and the youth under our tutelage second, are willing to make sacrifices to preserve our democratic nation which in 1940, despite our complaints and misgivings, remains the brightest spot in a world plunged into war and confusion. To a much greater degree than at present our high schools must become training grounds of democracy, if America is to remain a bright spot.

# Report of the Fraternal Delegate to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Chicago, March 29 to April 1, 1939*

By Paul P. Boyd
*Dean, University of Kentucky*

It was a somewhat weary fraternal delegate who arrived in Chicago on Thursday, March 30, 1939, after having attended the meetings of the Southern Association in Memphis during Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. But the throngs of the Association in the Stevens Hotel, the magnificent distances that stretched from one meeting place to another, and the many programs going on simultaneously quickly snapped me to wakeful attention. The bigness of the North Central Association was the first impression that I got. I started out from one side of the hotel at 8 o'clock to attend a meeting on the other side, and when I got there at 12 o'clock the meeting had adjourned. I can't say that I liked it altogether, for with size and numbers there comes, necessarily, more of the movement of a great ponderous machine which is likely to be guided as it were by electric controls from the unapproachable inner regions, and less of the spontaneous, the familiar, and the informal—more of passive listening, and less of extemporaneous debate. However, there was one feature of this convention that made me feel thoroughly at home—the lobby discussions that went on seemingly day and night.

The program was full and rich. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education devoted all of Wednesday afternoon to a public program of papers and reports. There were addresses on the curriculum in the University, the curriculum in the liberal arts college, programs in physical education, and reports from the Secretary of the Commission, from the Committee on Preparation of High School Teachers, the Committee on Studies in Certain Curricular Fields (mathematics in this case), and from committees in charge of supervision of various experiments approved by the Association. On Thursday morning the Commission held a joint session with the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Curricula of Secondary Schools and Institutions of Higher Education, and on Thursday afternoon this same Commission occupied the center of the stage with a program in the grand ballroom. Here Dr. C. H. Judd gave his address on federal aid in education. These programs of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education impressed me as much as any other feature of the meeting. I wish that our Commission would do the same sort of thing. We have

* Delivered at the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

turned over to the college deans a program that ought to be conducted by the Commission.

The Commission on Secondary Schools carried on programs throughout Wednesday and Thursday that were quite similar to those of our own Commission. One session was of especial interest—a conference of high school principals with the Commission on Secondary Schools. Nineteen subjects were listed in the program and about half of these were called up for discussion. The chairman kept things moving. He was "lousy" with wise-cracks, and a thoroughly good time was had by all. It was a revelation of the possibility of a good, stimulating instructive discussion in a large group. This demonstration of the possibilities of an open discussion in a large group was the third striking impression that I got at the meeting.

The Commission on Curricula of Secondary Schools and Institutions of Higher Education also conducted full public programs on Wednesday and Thursday afternoons. One session was devoted almost entirely to a report of a committee on preparation of secondary school teachers. The other session was taken up with consideration of the status of athletics in the high schools, of curricular trends, of student activities, of functional organization of secondary school curricula, of certain experimental units, and of adjustment of curricula to pupil needs in the high school.

The general programs of the Association started Friday morning and continued through Saturday morning. Friday morning's papers were especially worthwhile. President Boucher spoke on "Current Educational Problems and Possible Adjustments." President Bennett discussed "Coördination of Higher Education," and President Clevenger took as his subject, "New Conceptions of Secondary Education and their Implications to Higher Education."

Friday evening in the vast Grand Ballroom, seating two or three thousand people, possibly, one hundred and fifty or two hundred weary delegates gathered to hear the fraternal delegates and our own President Gaines. We were lined up on the rostrum in the usual style and jumped to the center of the stage to make our little speeches as the chairman pulled the strings. George S. Miller of Tufts College spoke for the New England Association, Rix Haight for the Northwest Association, D. A. Robertson of Goucher College for the Middle States Association, and your humble servant for the Southern. Then President Gaines leaped to the rescue of the somnolent and comatose faithful few and brought them back to the land of the living with a magnificent address on "Some Educational Constants." That saved the day.

I have alluded to the lobby sessions, where I felt quite at home. Here were the familiar small groups of old friends talking over former days or some outstanding address or some committee report that was to come up for action or some Association politics. A great deal was said of the so-called

strike of some of the larger state universities which had absolutely refused, come what might, to fill out some of the long and tiresome and allegedly trivial questionnaires that had been sent to them. And one of the church-related college presidents was complaining that his state university was engaging in unfair competition when it gathered high school seniors together at various points under the pretense of guidance but in reality recruited them for the university.

All in all it was a grand meeting of educational leaders, affording a program of unusual fullness and richness, showing clear signs of a progressive attitude and an awareness of the present-day world and its challenges. I was shown every courtesy and was made to feel thoroughly at home. That was appreciated deeply, as was and is the privilege of having been chosen as your fraternal delegate for 1939.

# Report of Fraternal Delegate to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Chicago, April 3 to 5, 1940*

By M. E. Ligon
*Professor of Education, University of Kentucky*

I appreciate the honor conferred on me by Father P. A. Roy in appointing me as a delegate to the North Central Association.

I attended the meeting for three days, April 3, 4, and 5. Upon my arrival in Chicago, Wednesday morning, April 3, I found myself in the hands of friends in the Stephens Hotel. I knew a good many of the school men of the North Central Association before arrival.

Every courtesy was extended to me in visiting the different commissions at work. I found very little difference in the work of that Association and our own Southern Association. The Association is much larger and, therefore, one does not make his way around so readily at the commission meetings as he would in our Association. The reports and programs were very similar to our own. In fact, there is not sufficient difference in the work of the two Associations to make an extended report.

I was much impressed with the fine attendance at all of the meetings. The addresses were outstanding. The Chicago papers did not seem to give as much space to the meetings of the Association as our papers in the South do in the cities where we meet. This may be due to the fact that the Association meets regularly in Chicago each year and is taken as a matter of fact.

The social side of the North Central Association is not emphasized in the way that it is in the Southern Association. Our own Association has a good many breakfasts, luncheons, and the annual dinner, all of which add to the pleasure and fellowship of the meeting. This was lacking in the North Central Association. I did not inquire into the reason for this fact, but my guess is that it is due to the bigness and many attractions of the city of Chicago. The evenings were left practically free to the members of the Association to entertain themselves in the various places of amusement.

Serving as your delegate was a fine experience for me, for which I shall ever be grateful.

---

* A report of the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

# A Layman Looks At Your Profession*

By F. Edward Hebert
*City Editor, The New Orleans States, New Orleans, Louisiana*

I'm going to keep you after school this afternoon, because in the opinion of a layman representing another underpaid profession, many of you have forgotten your lessons of democracy which you learned in that little red schoolhouse of your childhood. Your profession and my profession have always appeared to have at least one thing in common. We together have cried aloud from the house tops that we were the most underpaid profession in the world. I shall not attempt to go into the merits of that argument, however, as I look at your profession.

The trend of the times is reflected in the fact that we again find ourselves hand in hand when some of our members see fit to organize themselves into "unions" in order to set up wage scales and working hours and establish other protective measures which heretofore have been reserved for the accepted man of toil who earned his daily bread by the sweat of his brow. In truth as I look around and see organizations within your group and within my group affiliated with the American Federation of Labor and the C. I. O., I began to wonder that we, who labor not with the shovel and the pick, are as a matter of fact living under the false assumption that we come from a profession, when by our actions we do everything to be accepted and classified as day laborers, one dependent upon the other to regulate wages and hours, the aggressive carrying the burdensome unambitious, the weak leaning on the shoulders of the strong, and all walking the road on which rugged individualism has been destroyed and regimentation set up as the ultimate goal. It seems that we not only believe that "all men are created equal" but are rushing forward to see to it that "all men die equal."

In this day of progress, mad and furious progress, not only have automobiles, chain stores, motors, airplanes, and clothes manufacture been speeded to cope with the demand for mass production, but education itself has been caught in the maelstrom, and we look in vain for the graduate who bears the stamp of the individual school of yesterday. In the mad hustle and bustle of today, our educational system is regimented, our youth is regimented, our teaching is regimented; and I shudder in horror as I see the America of tomorrow goose-stepping to the regimentation of the totalitarian state unless something is done about it and done immediately. That is why, I, a layman, look at your profession today with suspicious eye. You, you gentlemen of the teaching profession, you teachers in whose charge have been placed the instruction and guidance of the youth of Amer-

* An address delivered before the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

ica, in your expressed effort to preserve those heritages which have been guaranteed under the Constitution of these United States of America, have swung the pendulum so far that you are destroying that which you supposedly seek to preserve.

Not so many years ago, what is generally thought of as education was confined in an unpretentious school building presided over by a man who believed in emphasizing his points with birch and hickory. Reading and writing and 'rithmetic were the chief concern of the curriculists. Pedagogy was simple: one kept repeating until one learned. Memory was esteemed as highly as reason. It was rugged fundamentalism. Ethics were instilled by the promise of reward and the threat of punishment. Textbooks were sprinkled with morals. Colleges and universities were cloistered institutions, content with the relatively small number of graduates from the academies. Higher education for women was glared at as radicalism. Athletics were for the sons of gentlemen—most decidedly not for their daughters. Respectable women in those inhibited times were never without their vial of smelling salts, for custom demanded that they faint from any unseemly shock. That was man's world indeed. Laymen didn't look at education then and education didn't look at laymen. The common schools were taken for granted, were deemed sufficient for the common people.

But today laymen everywhere are looking at education, looking hard, and wondering. I say laymen, but I know that's not the word. There is no laity in the lexicon of education. In the century that comes between us and Horace Mann the school has taken possession of society; has taken possession of the preservation or the destruction of democracy and its ideals. Its processes begin with the pre-natal child and end in the cemetery.

The only "ism" in the schools of yesterday was nationalism. We pledged allegiance to our flag and to the republic for which it stands. Only recently two children refused to salute the flag in my native city. The children of our youth would have died a thousand times rather than commit such a sacrilege. Today a hundred "isms" are paraded before children on the theory that it is democratic to let them make a free choice of political philosophy. Are nationalism and patriotism undemocratic? How can democracy be developed and preserved unless devotion is taught to national ideals?

The classrooms of America are the frontiers of democracy. Mighty assault is being made on those frontiers, not only from without their ramparts but from within the ranks of those who are supposed to teach the preservation of the ideals which have been written in the blood of men who believed that there was something more in life than making a guinea pig out of tradition. Under the pretense and guise of allowing our students to form their own philosophy of government I charge that there are some members of your profession who have sown the seeds of Communism, Nazism, Fascism

and all the other "isms" in the book except nationalism and patriotism. And why do I make that charge?

Need you ask why I make such a charge? Look about your campuses today. Spotted on the American college campus today are subversive groups who parade under the banner of Americanism, striking a vicious and telling blow at the ideals and laws which give them the privilege to think, speak and worship as they please.

And who has caused these wolves of treachery to roam in the sheep clothing of loyalty and devotion? You, you who have taught to the American youth the governmental philosophies of Marx, Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini under the privilege of the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. You, you are responsible who have not only debunked but defamed our national heroes and ridiculed our national traditions as relics of a worn out, threadbare era of governmental philosophy and existence. Have the teachers of America the right to break down the principles and ideals of democracy? Have the teachers of America the right to teach that materialism is the only thing that counts? Have the teachers of America the right to teach atheism to children of religious parents? No. A thousand times no.

I want my children to be taught and to believe that there is a Santa Claus until such time as they are able to understand the true and real meaning of Santa Claus, and then I want them to believe that their dad and their mother will continue to be Santa Claus to them. I want my children to be taught and to believe that George Washington did cut down the cherry tree and never told a lie; and when they of their own desire and through no urging from poisonous and insidious doctrines of so-called "free thought" learn otherwise, their character will be built of the stuff that will make them realize that one spot on the sun does not rob it of its lustre and brilliance. I want them to have the same beautiful faith which caused that great newspaper editor to pen his now immortal editorial which began, "Yes, Virginia, there is a Santa Claus." I don't want them filled with the debunking ideas of Professor Harold Rugg who writes for young people:

"During this period the Supreme Court of the United States became a powerful influence in favor of Big Business. As you have already learned, the Republican party was sympathetic to Big Business. The long line of Democratic Presidents before the Civil War had appointed judges who were favorable to the Southern planters. Perhaps it was to be expected, therefore, that the long line of Republican Presidents from the beginning of the Civil War to the beginning of the World War should have made appointments which on the whole favored the capitalists."

"Is that true?" asks George Sokolsky. "Is it what we send our children to school to learn? Is it what we expect our children to believe? Have

teachers the right to undermine the patriotism, the respect for the sacred traditions and heritage of Americans who believe that the reason we have the kind of government in this country today is because our ancestors were imbued with the spirit which caused Nathan Hale to utter those immortal words: 'I regret that I have but one life to give for my country'; which inspired John Paul Jones to shout: 'Surrender hell, we've just begun to fight'; which prompted 'Light Horse Harry' Lee to say of George Washington: 'First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen'; and which heard Patrick Henry shatter the air with 'Give me liberty or give me death' and heard Daniel Webster proclaim: 'I was born an American; I have lived an American, and I will die an American.'"

I want my children to be taught that kind of patriotism, that kind of nationalism. That's the kind of philosophy and idealism of government which it is your duty to teach the youth of America in our institutions of learning. You have no right to teach them false doctrines of government contrary to the principles upon which this government was founded. You have no right to inculcate into them the kind of governmental philosophy which only recently saw the disgraceful hissing and booing of the president of the United States and his wife. I refer to the shocking exhibition of some members of the so-called Youth Congress at Washington. It was reliably reported that when it was suggested to several of the youths that perhaps it was a little indelicate to hiss the President of the United States, particularly in his own "back yard" four of them flung back: "What do you mean HIS? That lawn belongs to us!" And I place the blame for such an act right in the lap of members of your profession. I cannot and will not believe that if the youth of America had been schooled properly in nationalism and patriotism during their impressionable years in colleges and secondary schools there would have ever been such a disgraceful exhibition.

If the dictators of the totalitarian states deem it necessary to kill off the aged and assume control of the education of the youth in order to guarantee the preservation of a dictatorship, then I say it becomes us to insist that our children be taught that our ideals, traditions, and principles mean what they say and that our national heroes be honored and respected and not debunked or held in disrespect. Democracy, the republican form of government, is relatively in its infancy. It is still in swaddling clothes. If it is to live we must nourish it until it is able to withstand any and all assaults.

The three fundamentals upon which our government is built are the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and the freedom of religious worship. In our poor misguided desire to preserve that democracy on their fundamental foundations we find ourselves swinging the pendulum too far.

The press can and has taken care of itself. The press has repeatedly proved its ability to protect its rights. As long as there is freedom of the press there will be no dictatorship in America, and democracy will survive.

It is the duty of the press and it is incumbent on the press to know and to realize fully that the privilege of freedom of the press is not license. When the idea that freedom is license is allowed to grow, the freedom of the press will be destroyed and with its destruction will fall democracy.

The preservation of the freedom of religious thought is entrusted to the organized churches. Jew, Catholic, and Protestant are confronted with the task of preaching tolerance and the right of each man to worship his God in the manner in which he believes proper. But each church must know and must realize that the worship of God is not the teaching of bigotry, the sponsorship of narrowness, and the development of the lack of respect for the man who does not choose to worship any God.

We must look to you teachers to impart the thought and the knowledge that the right of freedom of speech as guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States is to be distinguished from uncontrolled practice of attacking the ideals and doctrines upon which the fundamental truths of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are founded.

Regretfully do I believe the conditions for imparting this thought and this knowledge do not exist in our schools and colleges of today. In your proclaimed desire to allow freedom of religious worship in your schools, you have destroyed respect for religion. In an effort to assure yourselves that nobody will be offended, you do not allow the use of the name God in some schools, with the resultant effect that God is entirely discarded. In attempting to allow freedom of religion, you destroy all religion and set up a new idea of religious thought.

Let me demonstrate what I mean. In order to prevent discrimination it is ordered that the Bible not be read because of the difference of thought between Jew, Catholic, and Protestant. The Protestants believe in the King James Bible "without note or comment." The Catholics believe that reading the Bible is dangerous without explanation, and the Jews contend that Jesus must not be mentioned, while the agnostic contends that God shall not be mentioned at all. The latter course is usually adopted, and as a result our educational system is potentially Godless and freedom of religious worship gradually destroyed, although we are guaranteed freedom of religion under the constitution. As a matter of record, most of the educational pioneers upon whose philosophy the American system was founded took it for granted that religion and education should go hand in hand. But, of course, that's "old fashioned" and has no place in any new fangled educational set-up, which must insist on "preserving" to the letter the provisions of the Constitution.

The greatest offender against the ideals and traditions of democracy and the most sinister and dangerous is the professor who sets himself up in his own little world as the last authority on his subject. I don't have to go into

minute description to describe this type of professor to you. You know him well. He is smug, self-satisfied, self-centered, resting behind an armor of degrees a yard long and believes that when he utters a theory the Oracle of Delphi has bellowed forth a fact which for the intents and purposes of his students is final and official. It is this smart-aleck type of professor, drenched in the superiority of his own importance and intellect who destroys most that which it is your responsibility to preserve. He takes fiendish delight in holding up as all important the fact that Washington probably did not chop down the cherry tree and adroitly minimizes the true character and greatness of a patriot who most certainly was a great man possessed of noble ideals, whether he cut down the cherry tree or not. It is this type of teacher who would prefer to dwell on the human frailties of the apostles than on their virtues and sacrifices. In this modern era the human ear is far more alert to the tongue of scandal than the voice of praise. In contrast to the legend, this type of professor would prefer to write the virtues of man on the sand and his faults on tablets of marble. Why do these men so love the abstract and abhor the concrete? Why do they seek to break down in their teachings that which is good and noble in practice? Instead of teaching and advocating destruction, why don't they preach the doctrine of construction?

Now I don't mean to create the impression that I believe not in learning the naked truth of governments and their builders. Far from it. But I do not believe that these truths—if they be truths—should be tossed to students before they are able to grasp their full meaning and significance, before they are able to analyze their relative importance, before they are able to balance the scale without prejudice or partiality. I have learned the falsity of many things which I, as a younger man, accepted as truths. But I have learned them because of my desire for research and not because they were hurled at me by some professor who was attempting to impress me with his knowledge and importance by breaking down the ideals and dreams of my youth. I know definitely that had I been confronted with some of the indisputable facts of life when I was of an impressionable and immature age I would today have had a far different outlook on life and its conduct.

If I had come to believe that there was no God because I had never heard the name of God uttered in the classroom, I would have been agnostic today with no hope for the future. If I had been taught in the classroom that our forefathers were scheming, conniving politicians instead of patriots and liberty loving zealots I would be waiting for "the revolution" today instead of facing tomorrow with the firm belief that the democracy under which we live is good enough for me, good enough for my children, and good enough for my children's children. If I had been taught and schooled in these Utopian "isms" which have no place in the same school of thought with Americanism, I would today be working for the destruction of democracy instead of its preservation.

The education of today to the layman has become something hard and cold completely devoid of tenderness, love, and sentiment. Educators, in their business-drenched eagerness to turn out the maximum number of products with the minimum amount of expense, have forgotten the moral and spiritual side of education. They have forgotten that what "makes good Christians makes good citizens."

Teachers, educators, and professors would attain and accomplish more permanent effect if they would substitute instructions on how to be good citizens instead of how to criticize and destroy government. Instead of advancing new theories of government they would do better to impress the youth of today with the simple basic principles of decency and honesty—not to lie, not to steal, not to cheat, not to graft.

There is nothing wrong with the democracy under which we live except the liberality that permits the planting of germs of dissension and unrest which become cancerous growths of contempt for authority and lack of respect for law and order. Instead of teaching theoretical panaceas for the solution of all governmental ills, you professors should instruct your students in the art of good citizenship and the exercise of the use of the ballot; and there would be no need for expounding the theories of Fascism, Communism, and Nazism. All the good results claimed for the "isms" of the world could be accomplished if the American youth was taught in our schools that voting is a sacrament of democracy and that not to vote is a form of treason. We never would have been faced with the political abuses which have run rampant all about us if the youth of our schools had been properly trained in their moral obligations as citizens and trained in their duty as defenders of a heritage which was purchased in the blood-stained snow of Valley Forge, defended at Gettysburg, and preserved at Chateau Thierry.

Our own institutions of learning would not have been seared with the ugly hand of graft and corruption if our schools and colleges and the members of your profession had done their duty and included in your curricula the instruction which convinces a student that it is his duty to protect the fundamentals upon which his government is founded and to take part in the actual conduct of his government, that it is his duty to participate in politics for the common weal.

That this is not a new thought or original with me makes it all the more important that you gentlemen take full cognizance of the import of its meaning. In 1932 the New York *Hearald-Tribune* said editorially: "We have a citizenry which is in part bored by politics, which looks on it as something below the average, which cannot even be persuaded to vote in the primaries of a national election to choose the leader of the nation. We have a population so poorly versed in politics and political economics that, when corruption and mismanagement of a public office is flaunted in their faces, they yawn and deem such mismanagement and waste a necessary evil. If

American schools would teach the youth to be public-minded, we would not be suffering from the political ills we have thrust upon us today."

If our youths are not educated to the responsibility of government and the necessity of their respect for law and order and the preservation of democracy, why make the laws? Making laws is an absurd and childish business if there be no sanction for law but the will of man. Now, you cannot deny God, or ignore God, and still have your Ten Commandments. Or if you do still have them, they are become a scrap of paper.

We make laws by the hundreds of thousands, but we remain lawless. It would be wiser to do what they did in Palestine in the days when there was no king and no judge. Every man did what seemed best in his own eyes. That doesn't necessarily spell nihilism, if every man believes in God to Whom he is responsible. But if there be no judge, no king, and also no God, there is chaos. We are coming to that. America has no king. It has no judge—none that it feels bound to obey.

Gangsters break the laws that they don't like. Racketeers break the laws that they don't like. Citizens break the laws that they don't like. Bankers and brokers break the laws that they don't like. Corporations break the laws that they don't like. Even legislatures break the laws that they have made. To all intents and purposes America has no court, no judge that it respects. And why? Because it is not recognized that God is behind the law. Because we find professors in our schools actually spreading a doctrine which advocates, under the guise and pretense of free speech and free thought, the overthrow of the government which makes the laws.

It is the duty of our educational system, it is your duty as professors to teach and instruct your students on how to be good citizens and on how to protect their rights and privileges under the constitution under which they live. You have no right to instruct them on how to destroy the ideals and principles which guarantee to them the right of free speech, freedom of religion, and freedom of the press.

Our tendency has been to accept that which has been handed to us. I believe that it is only because we have become thoughtless that we have fallen into this undesirable rut. I don't want to believe that it has been a deliberate lack of appreciation. The last generation saw the coming of the automobile and marvelled at it. That generation also witnessed the invention of the electric light and became startled. We of this generation accepted them as we would the coming of the dawn, but we became excited when we realized we could hear music with the aid of wires and we thrilled when we saw men span the oceans like birds. The radio and the airplane will be accepted by the next generation as inventions which always were. The next generation will have something new, something greater to stimulate its imagination.

Democracy is an old story to us. It was presented to the generation which

lived more than 150 years ago. Like new generations we thoughtlessly turn to something new and wander into fields which are only spider's webs for those of us who blindly and without proper thought and consideration seek governmental peace and contentment. We must not be misled. You as professors and instructors must not mislead those who are placed in your care lest you be charged with their fall.

The religion of Christ and of Moses is as true today as it was 2,000 and more years ago. New fangled creeds spring up about us each day. Sects and colonies challenge the religion of God but soon fade and die.

Democracy was born one hundred and sixty-four years ago. Its doctrines and its ideals spread to the four corners of the world until a war was fought to make the world safe for democracy. Whether that war was fought in vain remains debatable. The fact does remain that those totalitarian states which now exist have been founded on one of the premises of the republican form of government—equalization. But they are marked frauds and must cease to exist with the passing of each dictator who has twisted the minor and major premises of the democratic syllogism into a distorted conclusion to serve his own selfish purposes and advancement.

We in America, so far removed by the passing of time from the sufferings of those who founded this republic, forgetful of the sacrifices of the Washingtons, the Jeffersons, the Lincolns, the Jacksons and others who founded and preserved this great democracy, influenced by sinister teachings and fake promises, are dangerously destroying that republic by raising the misleading and erroneous hue and cry of preserving it.

We forget too easily what our country means, what democracy means, by just reading about it and accepting it in an abstract manner. "Liberty's too precious a thing to be buried in books. Men should hold it up in front of them every single day of their lives and say, 'I'm free, to think and to speak. My ancestors couldn't. I can, and my children will'." Students ought to grow up remembering that, and you, as professors, should see that they do it. Duty was a big word in the old school. Whim and personal convenience seem to have supplanted it in the new.

Let's go back to the principles, the teachings, and the ideals of the little red school house where our national heroes were truly heroes, where we were taught that the United States of America was the greatest country in the world, where we were taught and believed that the only "ism" was Americanism, there we were taught it was a privilege to be an American and to live under the Constitution.

The religion of Christ was just as true when preached from the open spaces of the mount 2,000 years ago as when preached from the gilded pulpit of a million dollar cathedral only last Sunday. The basic principles of education, moral and spiritual, the fundamentals of that on which education has been founded have not changed since the first one room rural school house was

built in America centuries ago. The same truth, honesty, decency, loyalty, and patriotism taught in the little red school house can and should be taught in the vast and magnificent universities which embellish the countryside and the cities of today. Real education and instruction is not to be measured by the grandeur of the buildings in which they are taught, nor by the glamor behind the almost endless series of regimented degrees which the teacher possesses. The yardstick of real education and instruction is to be measured by the character and tradition of the institution in which it is taught; by the sincere desire of the teacher to create instead of to destroy, motivated by the eagerness to have been instrumental in contributing to the state and nation a better citizen.

We can still progress and live according to the rules we learned at our mother's knee. We can continue to be an educated and informed people, fully cognizant of the human weaknesses of our forefathers without magnifying their faults and minimizing their virtues. We can grow to be a bigger nation and profit by our mistakes without destroying and breaking down the elements on which this nation was founded.

I want to thrill when I see the Stars and Stripes go by. I want to believe that the office of President of the United States is a great office. I want to believe that the youth of our nation is being instructed in our schools that "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" hold aloft the complete preservation of "God, Home, and Country." I want to believe that our teachers are men who believe in the freedom of religion and are not afraid to so express themselves. I want to believe that the teachers in our schools teach nationalism and patriotism and have no time for the teachings of Communism, Marxism, Fascism, and Nazism. And, yes, I too want to see a flag with RED flying over the dome of capitol at Washington, but with that red I want to also see the white and the blue!

A layman has looked at your profession, gentlemen, not through rose colored glasses but through the lens of time, and in the crystal ball of the future I want to believe that none but true, loyal, devoted patriotic Americans will teach our youth whether it be in humble grade schools or mighty universities.

Again I say, again I repeat, the classrooms of America are the frontiers of Democracy. It is up to you teachers of America, to you teachers individually and to you teachers collectively to prove your metal, to defend those frontiers and to make, not the world safe for democracy, but democracy safe in the classrooms of America.

I thank you.

# The Responsibility of the Southern Association to Democracy*

By P. A. Roy, S.J.
*President, Loyola University*

The political health of our United States is safeguarded by a democratic ideology that finds expression in our federal Constitution. Outstanding in that Constitution is the principle that the rights and interests of each individual must be respected; no individual may encroach upon the rights of another. Our government must acknowledge and defend the dignity of the individual. A happy blending of individual rights and group responsibilities is essential to our democratic way of life. The motto, *E Pluribus Unum* —one from many—is the epitome of the spirit of our democracy.

There is no particular group that should adhere more stringently to this principle than the educators of our country. It would be incongruous if, in matters pertaining to education, a people whose ideas of government are diametrically opposed to totalitarianism should bow in awed servitude to the assumed omniscient domination of any one educational institution or to the arbitrary dictates of any particular educational association. Dictatorial regulation of education, whether national or regional, has no place in our country. If our democracy is to be preserved such an anomaly cannot be tolerated.

In the United States there are thousands of educational institutions. If these institutions are to be effective for the benefit of our democracy, there must be some bond of unity integrating their effectiveness. If they are to be American and free, there must be regard and respect for their individuality and their multiplicity. The bond of union that should draw them together is a fundamental philosophy, a unity of purpose. American educational institutions should be united in the determination that their product will be an American citizen in the truest and best sense of the word—a being gifted by his creator with a mind that tells him unmistakably the purpose of his existence and the ultimate goal of all his actions, a mind that shows him clearly the difference between right and wrong, because it recognizes an objective standard by which it may distinguish what is right from what is wrong. Our educational institutions should be united in the noble desire to effect a product, an American citizen, who will plot intelligently and not under the urge of sheer emotion the means whereby he will realize ambitions that are worthy of his spiritual nobility and conducive to his attaining the ultimate goal of life; in a word, a man who possesses the virtue of

* The President's Annual Address delivered before the banquet meeting of the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940.

prudence. Our educational institutions should be united in the persistent effort to effect a product, an American citizen, who recognizes intellectually that he is a social being, that he is to live with other beings who have rights equal to his own to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that his daily actions must not give the lie to this intellectual conviction—one who possesses the virtue of justice. Our educational institutions should be united in the ambition to effect a product, an American citizen, who winces at no inconvenience resulting from his intellectual conviction, who yields to no power on earth that would deflect him from the path of justice, who if he must meet with defeat will go down in glorious defeat with the banner of his intellectual convictions still flying—one who possesses that magnificent virtue of courage, fortitude. Our educational institutions should be united in the grand purpose of effecting a product, an American citizen, who has sufficient strength of will to adapt means to ends, not ends to means, who has the unshakable determination to subordinate ephemeral and temporal ends to his ultimate and eternal end, thus moderating all his actions in such a manner that they always become means whereby he serves his God, his country, and his fellow man—one who has developed in himself the virtues of moderation and proper coördination.

It is only a fundamental philosophy of this kind that puts God where He belongs in the universe, and man where he belongs, and the state where it belongs. It is only such a fundamental philosophy as this that can give unity to the vast multiplicity of educational institutions in America. Let this fundamental unity be had, let our every effort be bent to its achievement and then it matters little how many elements of multiplicity or diversity there are in our educational institutions. The more of them the better, for —*E Pluribus Unum*—they all become one, they all are knit together by a bond of unity that defies disintegration. All will succeed in effecting a product, an American citizen, of whom any educational system may be justly proud.

It follows logically, therefore, in this unity of diversity and similarity which is the fundamental spirit of our American democracy, that no one educational institution or association has a monopoly on all worthwhile ideas. True, the students of our country must be protected from quackery in education. But education in one institution is not necessarily quackish or inferior for the fact that it does not conform to stereotyped forms that are considered ideal by another institution. Variations in the patterns of educational institutions are as helpful to the welfare of our country as variations of political thought are stimulating to the political life of our democracy.

History bears witness to the fact that plutocracy usually rots from within and is followed by disaster. A plutocratic administration of education has no place in American democracy. A soundly American educational institution is determined not by the vast expanse of its campus, not by the dozens

of its buildings, not by the thousands of its students, not by its millions in endowment; but by the quality of educational work that it is doing daily in molding and developing and producing ideal American citizens who will contribute to the public welfare throughout their lives.

All of our educational institutions, whether vast or small, enormously wealthy or just sufficiently endowed, can give our country the same quality of citizens. It is not according to the principles of our democracy for the wealthy to gain power and renown by crushing out of existence their less fortunate fellow citizens. The same holds true for our educational institutions. In education in our country, no less than in the government of our country, our motto should be that of our entire national life—*E Pluribus Unum.*

Our Southern Association has the ability, the experience, and the prestige to do the noble work of stimulating and guiding the educational endeavors of our region. It has done grand work in the past. We can read the history of its accomplishments with justifiable pride and with deep gratitude to those outstanding educators who made that history. It has fought inferior education. It has brought good education to higher levels of achievement. Our prestige and influence are ever increasing. But this may prove to be dangerous. We must beware of any possible desire for regimentation. We must resist firmly any possible tendency to enforce abject submission to rigid standardization by an unwarranted assumption of power over member institutions. The spirit of our democracy is individual liberty unfettered by the chains of dictatorship. In our profession this means individual liberty for educational institutions. It means freedom from a dictatorship of commissions and committees. We must remember that our commissions have only delegated authority from the members of the Association with the expressed mandate of using that authority for the benefit of the total membership.

We say that our Association is a voluntary organization. No institution is required to apply for membership. No institution is obliged to retain membership. That is true. That is real Americanism. But we should remember that we have in America organizations of communists, organizations of fascists, organizations of nazis, and even organizations of gangsters which proclaim that they are voluntary organizations and that no one is obliged to join them. But when anyone does become involved in such a group he is stripped of his individuality and of his rights of freedom of thought, freedom of action, and freedom of speech. He goosesteps with his fellow slaves at the command of a dictator or a dictatorial commission. The term voluntary association when applied to the Southern Association means more than voluntary entrance into the Association. Just because it is an American association it means that membership in it and activity in it are ever democratic. It is not a dictatorship; it is not an oligarchy; neither

is it a plutocracy nor an aristocracy. Our officials are not dictators; the officers of our commissions are not commissars. Our organization is, and we hope that it will ever remain, a democracy.

I like to think of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools as continuing to direct its member institutions along the never ending road of greater achievement in education. May the day never dawn when our Association will cease to strive for higher ideals. May the day never dawn when our Association, instead of encouraging our member institutions to better achievement, will seek rather to terrify them into trembling submission to stereotyped standards of education. May the day never dawn when our Association will deviate from our democratic principles that the power of the Association originates from the whole membership and is retained ultimately by the whole membership, that those elected by the membership to any commission are merely representatives of the members and possess no authority except that delegated by the members, and that that power is to be used always and only for the greater welfare of the members. Such union, coördination and coöperation are vital to our Association. Thus united, we shall stand; divided, we shall fall. It is the duty of each of us to see that we shall stand.

# Regional Accrediting Associations and the Improvement of the Education of Teachers*

By W. E. Peik
*Dean, University of Minnesota,*
*Fraternal Delegate from the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools*

This mutual exchange of delegates between the North Central Association and the Southern Association is a pleasure as well as an education for the delegates, and it is, I believe, a practice profitable to the organizations. After sitting in the annual meetings, yours here this week, ours at Chicago last week, it is clear to me that our problems are very similar, as are also our procedures, which consist of numerous commission and committee meetings, in endless procession, occasions where minutes are kept scrupulously, and in the pressure of routine where very few minutes are wasted. Real progress is made through discussion, with a continually increasing use of reports which involve analytical studies. Finally there is compromise in a democratic spirit by important people who take the progress of education seriously.

Improvement through standards rather than through standardization seems to be a note of continually greater emphasis. I am certain that what these associations are doing adds up to a major contribution for American education.

Our two organizations are the largest and most influential. At the University of Minnesota some one said, in a spirit of pleasantry, quite nonchalantly, that in our area he thought there were two authorities—the one, God, and the other, the North Central Association. He added as an aside, "and I fear that when the national teachers examinations are developed, we shall have a third."

In area the North Central is the largest, perhaps too large, for it includes about 250 colleges and universities, 45 junior colleges, and 2,900 secondary schools in 21 states. It encompasses Michigan on the northeast, Arizona on the southwest, Montana, Wyoming and Colorado on the west, and West Virginia on the east. Together our two associations, I believe, include 32 of the 48 states. With such influence and size, there of necessity comes a responsibility which it seems to me is taken very seriously.

As I study the programs, publications, and committee reports of the North Central Association, I find that the chief interests of the last year outside of the routine business have been the following: perfecting accrediting pro-

* An address delivered before the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 12, 1940.

cedures, particularly the accreditation of institutions of complex organization such as the large state universities; the selection, preparation, and certification of secondary teachers; the reorganization of curricula at both the secondary and the higher education levels; federal participation in student aid; the coöperative study of high school standards; student personnel practices; and the work of the American Council on Education. Running through so many of the discussions and reports is attention to the national youth problem with special relationship to employment, general education, vocational training, and education for citizenship which includes it all. Our devotion to democracy as a way of living has been intensified by seeing what it is and means to us in view of the actions and ends of other ideologies. I have noted that you are concerned also with much the same list of problems.

It is of course impossible for me to review for you our own thinking on such a wide range of activities and interests. Since I have followed most closely matters pertaining to the education of teachers, I may contribute most in the time at my disposal by confining myself entirely to that topic in which I know every one of you to be interested and in which our associations have had and are having various committees at work. The most important one of these was the committee on the subject-matter preparation of the high school teacher.

I am impressed with the prominence that these problems of the preparation of teachers are assuming with us in all national, regional, and state meetings. It is becoming more and more an all-faculty problem for each institution, and not merely the concern or prerogative of departments or schools of education. Teaching is important because schools are important. The schools of all levels now comprise 30,000,000 pupils and students, a staff of 1,100,000 teachers. This makes of teaching the largest learned profession. It is represented in every district or hamlet in which there are people. Potentially it is the most direct source of social approach to the control of the trend and quality of our culture. Summarizing recent committee reports, it seems to me there are in this area of teacher education a few problems of most concern to us all.

1. *Recruitment, Selection, and Guidance.*—The first of these is better recruitment, selection, and guidance. I would state the gist of our discussions and findings thus: Selection has to be made a process extending over the years rather than an event associated with admission alone or graduation alone. It should begin with secondary school guidance and end initially with certification after a probationary period of teaching. To this end we have some over-supply now of only about 25 per cent of those who want to enter teaching, which—it is found—is more largely an over-supply of academic teachers for the secondary level, and it exists more largely in the fields of English and social studies than in the others. This 25 per cent margin is all that we have to

work on to improve scholarship and personality through selection. The rest will have to be done with better guidance and a program of pre-service and in-service preparation of teachers. And may I say that when the largest of the other learned professions have only 160,000 persons in them, usually trained for a life career, while education has to maintain over a million teachers with an average tenure of only ten to twelve years, we may never expect that the scholarship average or median on tests and examinations of cultural attainment may be quite up to the other professions. For every doctor admitted to a medical school, higher education has to admit from twenty-five to thirty persons for teaching. Medians cannot possibly be the same. I am surprised that we do not lag more. The only source of more high grade recruits is some inducement like scholarships and good guidance to get more of those persons of high ability who do not go to college for financial reasons to go into teaching. That is a problem of recruitment through secondary school guidance and would be helped by state scholarships as much as by college guidance and selection. To attract persons from other professions, salaries, tenure, and old-age security for the teaching profession will have to improve. I have stated in a common topic a few crucial points that are often overlooked in our conferences and discussions at association meetings.

2. *General Education.*—The second major problem in the preparation of teachers is the general education of teachers, which is one of the chief reasons why we must advance to the four-year minimum for elementary, including rural teachers, and to five-year programs of preparation for the secondary teacher, as rapidly as possible. We must face the general education problem more functionally and realistically than we ever have. Over-departmentalization, technical introductory courses designed for majors, confusion of the idea of rigorous standards for discipline with the standard of needs, reluctance about full admission of the fine arts to respectability in our college programs of study, emphasis on the social, economic, political, and educational problems of today, but not at the expense of a full appreciation of our social heritage—all these need attention in this picture.

3. *Specialization and Certification in Broad Teaching Fields.*—A third major problem concerns the nature of specialized preparation for teaching and the limitation of state certification to fields in which preparation is adequate. Specialization for research, the increase in the number of subject-matter departments, the fractionalization of departments themselves into highly specialized research areas, and the trend to control the elective principle of general education through devices like majors and minors, have resulted in subject-specialization as teaching majors and minors. It is intensified in graduate work. It is my con-

viction after much study of the problem and of our reports that best specialization for secondary teaching is wide specialization in such broad fields as science, social studies, language and literature, rather than in thirty to forty narrower subject-majors like history, physics, English literature, etc., with say 60 semester or 90 quarter credits in broad fields rather than half that many in one subject. Even the fifth year should be used for breadth rather than for specialization to meet modern secondary school needs. Specialization for college teaching at the doctorate, of course, is quite another matter, but it, too, will be improved with a broader, deeper base.

4. *The Courses in Education and Practice Teaching.*—The importance of this professional content is now quite generally accepted. There is a difference of opinion about the amount of it, and there is criticism of its character. I believe that much of what is often done now can be done in less time, but what is available and what we should do will take more time than we now have for it even now. We must ask ourselves frankly what must the average teacher know about such professional units as the making of good examinations, what do we know about it, and how long does it take to train teachers to do an acceptable job in their fields. The same thing applies to the preparation, execution, and evaluation of teaching units, and at least a score of other topics. Our pedagogy, too, must be based more consciously upon psychology, philosophy, biology and the socio-economic foundations of education. It is becoming less and less a mere matter of methods based upon personal experience of the instructor. Above all, each teacher must develop a philosophy which relates his profession to our culture. Our teachers must understand the social function of education. One of the most promising movements of the later thirties is the approach of academic and education departments to solve such problems together; another is the increased attention given to supervised student teaching followed by internship.

*Summarization.*—These areas then—recruitment, selection, guidance, and final certification as one process, that is the functionalization of general education toward a high level of citizenship, with broader teaching field specialization and broader, more scientific technical foundations for pedagogy—it seems to me, are the problems which the studies of the North Central Association and the studies of other agencies raise to problems of major concern to us all. To our associations they offer challenge, opportunities and obligations.

In conclusion may I thank you for the many courtesies and pleasant experiences you have extended to me. I shall go back with enthusiastic reports about your activities, your forward look, your fine spirit, your leadership, and your ability as hosts.

# The Southern Association Studies Education For American Democracy*

By H. L. Donovan
*President, Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College*

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is holding its forty-fourth annual meeting in Atlanta this week. Perhaps the radio audience would like to know something about this organization. It is made up of representatives from 210 colleges and universities and 1,200 high schools from eleven Southern states. It meets each year for the purpose of studying the problems which relate to the education of the youth of our region. Its primary objective is to guarantee to the boys and girls and to the young men and women of the South the quality of education a high school and a college are supposed to give. It protects the public from institutions that cannot meet the standards of a good school or college. It is a voluntary organization of schools and colleges whose representatives determine what character of education is best for our youth. The Southern Association was democratically conceived, and it is democratically administered.

The program theme of the meetings of the Association this year is: "Education's Responsibility to Democracy." If you are a visitor at any of the meetings which are being held this week at the Biltmore Hotel, you will hear one speaker after another talk about the problems of democracy and the responsibility of the school and college to contribute something to the solution of these problems. If you cannot attend the meetings, you may be interested in listening to the fourteen radio programs to be given over WSB and WGST. Representatives of the various types of schools and colleges will attempt to explain to the radio audience the roles or functions of their schools in American democracy.

Democracy as a form of government has not enjoyed a rapid rise in the history of mankind. Its progress has always been challenged by the rich and powerful of this earth. Kings, emperors, czars, and potentates through the ages have regarded it as a plague. The weak and ignorant have usually been indifferent to its development. During the latter part of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as knowledge spread and education became more nearly universal, democracy experienced a new birth. Our American and French Revolutions were potent forces in the growth and development of democracy. A quarter of a century ago the forces of autocracy and democracy met in mortal combat on the battlefields of Europe. The outcome of

* An address delivered over radio station WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, April 8, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

this titanic struggle left the average citizen with the feeling that the world had been made safe for democracy. Twenty years ago it appeared that it was only a matter of time until every nation would enjoy a democratic form of government and that freedom, justice, and right would prevail among civilized men.

How quickly we have been disillusioned. In less than a score of years we have witnessed the rise of the dictator and the totalitarian state, a form of government in which man has been divested of all his rights and privileges as a free agent. A large part of the world's population is now living under this form of government. Democracy is again challenged. It is in more danger today than it was at the Congress of Vienna in 1814, when the crowned heads of Europe met to put it down forever. It is a militant opposition that democracy faces today. The dictators are using a method in their attack on republican forms of government never before employed. They are teaching the youth of their countries that democracy is a vile and vicious way of life. I saw and talked with bright, attractive youth in both Germany and Russia who cursed democracy and swore that some day they would be able to destroy it. These young people hated democracy as a righteous man hates the Devil. Their hatred is born of propaganda on which they have been fed from their early childhood. They extolled the virtues of Nazism or communism with the same enthusiasm they had denounced democracy. Their thinking, if indeed they thought at all, was very naive. It was a blind faith which had been built up in these young people by their leaders. The point I wish to make here is that dictator governments are busy creating in the youth of their lands certain attitudes toward their form of government and against democracy.

Contrast this policy with our attitude toward government in democratic America. All too frequently in the home, the school, the forum, the countinghouse, the corner drugstore, and the crossroads garage, we vilify democracy, denounce politicians as corrupt, and tolerate government as something to be endured. Very little effort is used to lead the youth of our land to understand and appreciate the virtues of our democracy. This is going to have to change. It is changing today. Both the home and the school will in the future teach children and youth the cardinal virtues of democracy. We shall not do this as propaganda, for we would be repeating the error of Germany and Russia. In our more progressive schools today we are teaching the good and bad about democracy. We are encouraging students to devise ways of eliminating the bad. We are attempting to get the young to reason things out. Through careful guidance in the classroom we are assembling information about what a good government is doing or can do for its people. Here are a few of the things the youth of our schools are being made to realize about democracy:

That it guarantees religious liberty;
That free speech is accorded everyone;
That a newspaper can be free if it chooses;
That the right of trial by jury is guaranteed every citizen;
That one may travel anywhere in the nation without being molested by the law;
That a free public school is available to practically every child;
That a youth can secure college education if he has the ability and energy to make the effort;
That military service is not compulsory unless the nation is at war;
That the poor and underprivileged can and do often overcome their environment;
That the youth without work are being assisted by the NYA and CCC;
That the needy aged are being pensioned;
That there are government agencies to alleviate sickness and suffering;
That a consistent effort is being made to guarantee jobs for all but that to date this has not been fully achieved;
That our government is attempting to build better homes for its people;
That every citizen has the right of suffrage;
That tolerance is regarded as a virtue in a democratic state;
That the nation is interested in the general welfare and happiness of each citizen.

This is but a partial list of the freedoms guaranteed the citizens of our country. For these privileges there should be gratitude in our hearts. They are living, vital principles as essential to our well-being and happiness as the food we eat or the air we breathe. It is one of the purposes of the schools and colleges today to teach our students to appreciate and value this heritage which has been vouchsafed to us. It is not mere lip service that democracy is receiving in many high schools and colleges in our region. Democracy is a living, basic thing in the life of the school in many of our educational institutions. These institutions are so organized that the student finds himself an active citizen of the school, helping to plan its program, direct its activities, and evaluate its results.

At our college at Richmond, Kentucky, the students elect sixteen of their number to attend faculty meetings and participate in the planning of the educational policies of the institution. Students are on all faculty committees and assist in planning and administering the work of the college.

Schools at every level in the past have all too frequently been organized on autocratic lines. The principal, the head master, or the president has had absolute authority. In such an organization there was no place in the everyday life of the student where he participated in democratic living. He was a citizen of a little kingdom where all decisions were made for him. A school so organized and administered is missing its best opportunity to de-

velop in its students an appreciation for and practice in the democratic processes. There is no better laboratory for the practice of democratic ways of living than a school or college so organized and administered as to permit every student to become an active, aggressive, working citizen of the school charged with the duty and responsibility of helping to make his school a vital, functioning organization for democracy.

The schools and colleges of the Southern Association are studying the problems of democracy as never before in their history. These institutions are leading their students to think on these problems. Our students are aware that one-third of our nation's population is today inadequately fed, clothed, and housed, that ten or twelve million workers are unemployed, that equal educational opportunities are not provided for all children, that the health of our people can be improved, that we have a crime problem, that our soil must be conserved, that we have a responsibility in world affairs, that government itself must be kept clean, efficient, and subject to the will of the majority. With a knowledge of our problems we may depend upon the enthusiasm, courage, audacity, and hope of youth to find a way to steer the ship of state into a new era of peace, prosperity, and happiness for our people.

# The Southern Association and Its Value to the Democracy of the Nation*

By C. A. Ives
*Dean, Louisiana State University*

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools is this week holding its forty-fourth annual session in the city of Atlanta, Georgia, and I have been asked to speak briefly to the radio audience on "The Southern Association's Value to Democracy in the Nation."

The Southern Association is the highest unofficial source of educational influence in the Southern states. It speaks for higher education in the South and for some 1,200 outstanding secondary schools. Its membership consists of 142 colleges, 48 junior colleges, and 1,187 accredited secondary schools, and the state departments of education from Virginia to Texas, inclusive. It has almost a half century of activity in the effort to promote education in the South. During that time, hundreds and thousands of devoted men and women have sat around the council tables to discuss the issues and problems of Education. They have assembled data, submitted reports, and conducted intensive studies to discover to themselves and to reveal to the public what constitutes a good standard college or school. They have set forth from time to time desirable minimum standards as to faculty, equipment, and other conditions of a good school or college. The publication and maintenance of these standards have had a persuasive influence in forming public opinion and guiding the policies of educators. Education in the South has been stimulated and has made notable advances as direct outcomes of the labors of this association. The extent to which it has affected education is the measure of its value to democracy. One cannot state that value in an objective form. Education throughout the nation has grown in extent and vitality during the last fifty years. The South has made especially noteworthy progress in that time in the training of personnel, the amount spent annually, and in the types and quality of the programs of education. Many factors have contributed to this accomplishment, but thoughtful people will assign much credit to the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Dr. John Dewey has said that the kind of education that the wisest and best of men want for their children is the kind of education all children should have. We do not have that kind of education for all because we never get a sufficient proportion of the people to understand or want it. If the people could appreciate the social significance of superior educational

* An address delivered over radio station WGST, Atlanta, Georgia, April 8, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

advantages, they would make their desires known to legislatures and officials in a manner that would command attention. To aid in the development of that understanding and appreciation is the duty of all public spirited people, and is a primary function of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

Public opinion in a democracy is a slow but wholesome process for any kind of social advance. Public laws and policies are a fair reflection of public opinion, public desire, and then public law. Many kinds of influences shaping public opinion lie outside official bodies and official effort. Some of these are the press, radio, pictures, free speech, freedom of teaching, and the pronouncements and decisions of unofficial educational bodies. Just here is a distinctive contribution the Southern Association is making to education in the South. Its activities do not rest on any statutory or legalistic provisions. It is a voluntary organization in which the educational leadership of the South pools its thinking. Its judgments and policies receive and justly receive very great respect. Its procedures exemplify the democratic process, and make of the Southern Association a constructive agent in this area for the development of more enlightened opinion on the problems of secondary and higher education.

Democracy is not so much a form of government as it is an inner spirit, an attitude, a state of mind, a way of life. Its most significant characteristics are freedom, justice, tolerance, opportunity, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, freedom of the person. The congenial social climate produced by democracy is made possible by the particular kind of assumptions one man applies to another and one nation applies to another.

Democracy assumes the inviolability of a man's private and personal rights. These rights must not be violated either by another person or by the state. Within his own sphere the dignity of the individual is of the same kind as the dignity of the state, and the dignity of one state is of the same kind as the dignity of another state. There are not special persons with superior rights and no special nations with superior rights. Democracy assumes that men differ in intelligence, industry, and thrift and that the conditions of life will likewise differ. Democracy is denied where power is applied either by the individual or the nation as an aggressor to seize what of right belongs to another or to curtail the free exercise of civil or religious rights.

Freedom to teach and freedom to learn undergird the democratic process. Our higher institutions of learning in the South are conscious of their opportunity and their responsibility to give our youth the knowledge, the will, and the power to uphold the democratic way of life, and to solve the problems of democracy.

Democracy is not an easy thing to establish nor an easy thing to maintain.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." Democracy is an exalted state of society which develops from the devoted thinking and effort of good and great men—men of noble mind, courageous spirit, and gifted leadership. As democracy gives an opportunity for great and good men to mold a people to higher ends, it permits designing and lesser men to practice demagoguery, to befuddle the public mind, and to raise false issues. It permits men to propose or defend wrong causes either from selfish or misguided motives. The cure for that is enlightenment. We cannot have a democracy without risks. We cannot cure the ills of democracy by denying democracy.

The founding fathers were a very brave people to set up a democracy here in America at a time when education was so little diffused among the people. Their bravery was qualified somewhat by the provisions in the states to limit suffrage by educational or property requirements, and sometimes by both. But Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and others fully expected the country to develop an educational program that would insure enlightened citizens and full voting privileges to the people. Jefferson revealed this when he said, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." In his *Farewell Address* Washington proclaimed his position saying, "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened." James Madison held similar views and gave expression to his forceful convictions in the following language, "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps, both."

It is probably true that we cannot hope to prepare competent citizens by merely making them literate or giving them a cultivated mind. Two of the most literate nations in the world are Germany and Japan. Both can be held up as examples of the inadequacy of mere education. Miseducation, it seems, can do as complete a job as any other. The pursuit of truth cannot with safety be canalized. The mind of the individual must have access to the facts that matter, if a people is to be guided in a rational course of action. The dreadful wars now scourging the world have resulted from the suppression of one set of facts and opinions and the industrious propagation of another. A mind-set for war has resulted from carefully laid designs of autocratic rulers until war and its brutalities and miseries acquire the inevitability of fate. This sort of thing democracy can cure.

There is need therefore for the youth of America to have positive instruction in the duties and privileges, and in the blessings, of democracy as we know it in America. The intensive survey of youth conducted in Maryland by the National Youth Authority in which 20,000 youths between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four were interviewed showed that one-third of those of voting age had not voted. Evidently the schools had failed to impress them with the performance of this duty as one mark of a good citizen.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools promotes democracy by its activities to energize and elevate education in secondary schools and in the halls of institutions of higher education in all of which the principles of American democracy are upheld, but it zealously guards the integrity of our educational institutions against undue pressure from political or other outside groups that seek to use educational institutions for selfish and unworthy ends. With dignity but with great firmness it has used the power of its prestige to protect one, a few, and sometimes a whole state from untoward outside pressure. An editorial in the *Times-Picayune* of March 10, on "Education and Citizenship," quotes from a small book of essays on *Practical Politics* published by Theodore Roosevelt in 1888. Roosevelt said: "American citizens should strive each to fulfil his own political duties as they arise and thereby to do each his part in raising to a healthier level the moral standard of the whole country." Roosevelt quotes Joseph Choate, our ambassador to England at that time as follows:

> I confidently believe that the decay of our politics, which all must acknowledge, has arisen in no small measure from the neglect of their political rights and duties, for the last twenty years, by the great body of educated men of the country and the still greater body of business men of the country, whereby the management of party affairs has been left so largely to those who make it a trade and a profession. And so I hail with delight and satisfaction the revival of interest and action in any form, in these great representative classes of the community. The renewed attention which has been given of late years in all our leading colleges and universities to the study of political economy and other public and constitutional studies is one of the most cheering signs of the times.

The editorial then adds:

> More than a half century ago, it appears, Americans of light and leading not only were grieving over "the decay of our politics," but urging their educational institutions to give more attention to the training of their students for citizenship. Both topics, of course, are as timely today as then—and perhaps even more widely discussed. Revolts against political corruption and machine control of state governments are applauded the country over as heralds of cleaner politics and better government. Also there is continuous and insistent demand for better training in citizenship by America's educational system.

Just as American education and American democracy have grown and developed through the years, the Southern Association only gradually has reached the position of influence it now enjoys. For nearly three decades its leaders took a rather narrow view of its scope. During that period there was a disposition to limit its functions to problems of the liberal arts college. It required time for it to discover the full scope of such an organization and recognize a responsibility in relation to those institutions dealing with agriculture, engineering, and the like. Teachers' colleges, and colleges of agriculture, engineering, and commerce, and other technical institutions have an educational work as important or as essential as that of traditional edu-

cation. The earlier conservatism of the Association is evidenced by the fact that the first agricultural college was admitted to membership in 1922 when the Alabama Polytechnic Institute became a member, the first teachers' college in 1923, and the first junior college in 1925. Georgia Tech came into the Association in 1923.

For the last two decades our Association has been governed by more liberal thought, has sought to deal with the whole field of education, expanded its organization, enlarged its personnel, set up a permanent research commission, and developed enlarged annual programs. The Southern Association has an aggressive attitude toward its opportunities and responsibilities and has a future of continued usefulness before it.

# The Relation of the Endowed University to Our Democracy*

By O. C. Carmichael
*Chancellor, Vanderbilt University*

For purposes of this discussion the term "endowed university" shall be construed to mean the institution of higher learning not supported by the taxes of the people. The college receiving support from a church will be considered as endowed and independent. With this definition of terms let us look at the picture of American higher education as a whole. Of the twelve hundred colleges and universities in the country, six hundred and seventy-five are independent of state control. This is more than one-half the total number of institutions, but they do not represent one-half the student population. A considerably larger number of students attend state institutions, at least in every section except the northeast, There has been a noticeable change in the proportion of students in the two types of institutions during the last few decades, and the end is not yet. In a recent article, Professor Hollis states "that within the next two decades it is probable that the history of higher education will record a change from philanthropic to tax support that will parallel the development of American secondary education during the last fifty years."

With this background in mind let us consider the reasons for the perpetuation of the independent institutions in a democracy. The first is the fact that the endowed and not the public schools have served as the laboratory for research and experimentation. To them we owe the present-day conception of a curriculum as an integration of life experiences rather than a succession of separate subjects arranged in the order of difficulty; to them we are indebted for the conception of education as a process of living as well as a preparation for life. It is the private rather than public institutions that have led in the development of the significance of boys' and girls' clubs, of the meaning of community centers, and adult education, of the value of supervised summer camp life and of vocational training, etc., etc. It was the endowed college, the social settlement, and the church organization that instituted these programs long before they were ever incorporated in our public educational system.

In the second place, the endowed university has led the way in the development of high scholastic standards, and in intensive programs of fundamental research. By its example the state university has been encouraged to follow suit. The result has been to raise the level of educational achieve-

* An address delivered over radio station WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, April 9, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

ment throughout the entire educational system. For example, without Johns Hopkins, Clark, Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, it is difficult to conceive of just what the university development of this country would be now. Moreover, most educational reforms have begun in the endowed university. The program of medical and legal education developed at Harvard under the leadership of President Eliot changed the whole character of university curricula in these fields. The elective system in the College of Arts and Science at Harvard pervaded the entire college system. The recent experiment at Chicago has produced a profound effect on educational thinking in this country in the past decade. Many other examples might be cited to show the tremendous influence of the independent university in the field of educational reform.

In the college field recent examples might be cited. Swarthmore and Reed colleges adopted honors courses that were widely used though in modified form at state colleges. In the nature of the case it is difficult if not impossible for the state institutions to pioneer in educational programs and procedures, and yet it is through such pioneering that progress is made. Unless the independent institutions are able to maintain a position of leadership in the college and university world, they will become ineffective as pioneers, and an inestimable loss to education will result.

Another incalculable service which the endowed university has rendered to our civilization is in the maintenance of the ideals of academic freedom, the spirit of free inquiry, and the search for objective truth. The battles for these ideals which have been of such overwhelming importance in American life have been fought out principally by those institutions that were independent of public support. It is an indisputable fact that the domination of education by the state tends to stifle the very creativeness that genuine education should foster. It is highly important that education be accorded the privilege of serving one master and one master alone—Truth.

In some quarters such terms as *Aryan science* and *Soviet biology* are used with all seriousness by the apostles of the new orders of social control. Nothing could demonstrate more clearly that the complete affiliation of state and education is an unholy alliance that leads to the enslavement of the mind of man. Science and education, to be worthy of the name, must be concerned with universal values and must brook no limitations arbitrarily imposed from without in the attainment of their fundamental objectives. To make certain that such a spirit will be maintained it is of first importance that those colleges and universities which are not subject to the bias of contemporary thought be continued in positions of leadership. Viewed in this broader light, the seriousness of the threat involved in the curtailment of the influence of the endowed institution becomes apparent. As guardians of some of the finest elements in American culture they warrant the most vigilant cultivation and protection and the most generous support from those concerned

with the preservation of fundamental values. Dr. Ralph C. Hutchinson, President of Washington and Jefferson College, emphasized this fact recently when he said: "We hold that in the battle against the super-state, against state control of thought and political control of education, it is valuable to have alongside the state universities a system of colleges not beholden, not subsidized, not so quickly amenable to political interference. The day will come when the sturdy independence of endowed colleges may help to save the others from political strangulation." Following the same thought, Mr. Wendell Willkie recently stated: "Without the leadership of the independent college, our educational system today would be in danger of accepting present political standards as unquestioningly as they are now accepted by educational institutions in Germany."

There is something in the temper of our times that is at once both a menace to the independent colleges and the surest sign of the need of such institutions. I refer to the drift toward the control of the individual through regimentation in its many forms. It is evident in American life to an extent undreamed of by those who fought the early battles for liberalism. A loss of faith in the individual, an increasing belief in the necessity of collective action, a tendency to pin our faith on collectivism and to forsake the essential tenets of liberalism are distressing elements in the spirit of our times. Such a spirit is essentially unfriendly to the private and independent institution, but the very fact that it exists is proof of the great need for strengthening such institutions, to the end that the spirit of liberalism may continue to exist and to wield its beneficent influence.

# The Role of the City High School in American Democracy*

By H. M. Ivy
*Superintendent, Meridian City Schools, Mississippi*

### What is a Democracy?

The French Revolution boiled down into three words the then philosophic ideals of democracy when it gave expression to the slogan, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Each of these is a broad term and like religion has had many violences done in its name. In general, liberty and equality have to do with the relationship of others to the individual, while "fraternity," brotherhood, brings in the spiritual values of democracy, turning "the responsibility of others to me," into "what is my responsibility for my brother." Out of this relationship has developed most of the social ideals and legislation of recent times. In it are involved the protection of the weak, coöperation in enterprise, the altruistic point of view, and finally the application of the Golden Rule in economic affairs.

Its very nature prevents democracy having a *status quo*. So long as the individual has the freedom to exercise his initiative and resourcefulness there will be changes in the status of society. The type of government will reflect in general that status. The individual recognizes liberty and equality in limited ways. It is only as his own liberty is infringed or his own equality may be challenged that he is in turn caused to consider the liberty and equality of his neighbor. The American is frequently cited as being more non-law-abiding than the citizen of any other country. Of course, this charge has been denied, but a large part of this attitude is based upon the idea that since the American citizen makes the law, he must therefore be superior to it. The law is a good thing for the other fellow; but as to the individual, since he made it, he can un-make it. Particularly since it may not suit his convenience to have it apply in the particular instance. Another Americanism that portrays our idea of equality is the expression "I and my folks are just as good as anybody, but there are mighty few folks as good as we."

Each generation brings with it a clearer conception of liberty and equality, with a corresponding development of the acceptance of responsibility for our brother. The chief characteristics, then, of a democracy would seem to be:

1. A society in which every individual has an inherent value to himself and to his fellows, and is entitled to that opportunity necessary to find and develop that value;

* An address delivered over radio station WGST, Atlanta, Georgia, April 9, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

2. A society in which every individual has the liberty to manifest that value in his life relationships whatever they may be;
3. A society in which every individual is aided by government to find and develop his values, individual and social, and protected by government in manifesting his values.

### What Should the High School Do?

As an institution of a democratic society, which is itself in a state of flux, what can the high school do in the clarification and accomplishment of the democratic process? Unless the high school answers this question effectively, it will be cast off as an agency of democracy.

The high school has numerous functions to perform in a democracy. The difference between the rural and urban high school is chiefly one of environment rather than in ultimate objectives. Among these functions which the high school should perform may be enumerated:

1. Interpreting democracy in its theoretical aspects;
2. Practising democracy so far as the immaturity of its pupils will permit;
3. Coöperating with private educational agencies seeking the same objectives;
4. Coöperating with other public agencies seeking the same objectives.

### How May the High School Achieve Its Role?

Aspiration without achievement may be spiritually elevating but it does not get us any where practically. One of the first responsibilities of the high school is to interpret to its pupils the background and purposes of a democracy. This may be done through courses in the social studies so organized and carried out as not only to set up ideals of government and society but to point out specific causes of the downfall of peoples and civilizations. There must be illustrated specifically the results of the continual conflict going on in any society between the altruistic and egoistic interests. John Sharp Williams gave voice in Congress at one time to the lament that he heard on every occasion a clamor with respect to the Bill of Rights of the citizens, but never yet had heard of any clamor on behalf of the Bill of Duties of the American citizen.

There must be introduced opportunities for choice where the wrong choice brings its own punishment provided the ultimate effect on the individual or group is not greater than the value of the training received. Discipline is necessary in the development of character. Without discipline the individual is not brought face to face with the rights of the other fellow or of his own duty to him. Discipline must be reasoning and reasonable but firm, particularly since in the high school is about the only place that many of our youth are faced with social considerations that call for self-control and self-direction. The high school must help the individual de-

velop a feeling of responsibility for himself and for his life not merely as a matter of "living his own life" but being responsible to his friends, to his family, to his community, and to his Creator as to how he lives it. Since a constantly smaller percentage of our youth are being influenced by the church, it becomes all the more essential that the high school hold up the highest standards of character and conduct.

The high school must teach its students to seek the truth wherever it may be found and give it recognition. We must learn to challenge propaganda and withstand crowd psychology. Whether the propaganda be the subtle advertising of tobacco in the "funny paper" he reads on Sunday, or whether it be the alluring whiskey advertisements constituting the chief make-up of the yearbook issued by his political party on the occasion of its national convention, he must be trained to recognize it.

The high school should coöperate with and support the efforts of the church, the scout organizations, and other character building agencies. Before lending its coöperation, however, to any agency it should carefully check *its* objectives and *its* administration in order to be sure that "things are what they seem."

In general, there are three groups of pupils with whom the high school has to deal: (1) those who expect to go on to college after graduation; (2) those who expect to get a job following graduation; (3) those who withdraw before graduation. The time is not long gone since the high school assumed no responsibility whatever for its members who did not graduate. The assumption that such pupils are not worth considering is wholly out of place in an institution of democracy. A manufacturer may produce an excellent piece of goods, but he may spoil so much material in producing that piece of goods that the total accomplishment is failure. The high school in a democracy must take account of its by-product, for experience has taught that frequently the youth who was "cast aside as unfit" for the school to graduate became the "head of the corporation." The high school should accept the pupils from the lower school sending them to it and reorient by acquainting them with its offerings. These offerings must take into account each of the three groups referred to above. It must also take into account not only the academically minded and those of high social intelligence but also those of mechanical intelligence. And which of these three types of intelligence is of the greatest value? You will doubtless recall the story of Houssain's carpet. Three brothers (princes) were in love with the same beautiful princess. She promised her hand to the one who returned at the end of a year to the court with the most valuable present for her. The brothers journeyed afar, and near the close of the year met in a far-off land. One had a magic mirror in which it was possible to vision any scene one wished to see. The second had a wonderful apple, which when eaten would not only keep the doctor away but cure the disease. The third had a magic

carpet on which one might sit and be whisked instantly to the place of his desire. Naturally the three brothers gazed into the mirror desiring to see their beautiful princess. Great was their consternation to view her on her death bed surrounded by physicians and sorrowing loved ones. Desiring to be present they stepped on the carpet and were whisked immediately to her bedside. The application of the magic apple restored her to health. To which of the three brothers would you have awarded the hand of the princess? And to which type of intelligence would you award pre-eminence?

Through constructive guidance the high school must help youth find his most valuable abilities and indicate the process to be followed in developing those abilities. While it must be pointed out to him that it is not all of life to live, he should be encouraged to make an early vocational choice. This is all the more essential if he does not finish high school or go to college, but it also involves not only going to college but going to the right college. Each higher institution should and does reserve to itself the right to determine its own objectives, which in turn implies it has the right and should exercise it to determine the qualifications those coming to it should have. Guidance implies assistance in finding one's way, but not dictation as to how one should go. The pay envelope is too frequently the decisive factor in the choice of a vocation. The white collar too frequently gives a greater appearance of success than the cover-alls. There yet remains in our country an equality of economic opportunity irrespective of the avenue by which one enters the field. One of the reasons for the delay in vocational choice of so many American youth is their lack of direct contact with more than a very few vocations. The diversified occupations plan now being carried on in many of our high schools is going far to help to adjust this situation. The high school should be the best source for a local employer to find his beginning employee through its guidance and follow-up work.

The high school needs to coördinate its efforts with a modified form of the NYA and the CCC Camp. There are in the junior and senior high schools of our country an increasing number of boys and girls whose interests and abilities are so diversified that the schools are unable to afford them the varied types of training that they should have. In fact, there are types of training which there seems to be no means at present for a city or town high school to undertake. The NYA now has a part of these facilities and the CCC Camp another part. The NYA is developing centers in which are found a variety of offerings, more or less exploratory in character, of all the various mechanic trades. Many of the boys referred to above should be admitted to these centers. After being there for one or two years, a part of these boys would return to high school to take more advanced training in the fields of science, mathematics, and citizenship necessary to further qualify them for their vocations. The possibilities are the others would be absorbed into the mechanic trades in the immediate vicinity of their homes.

Every summer vacation there are thousands of youth between the ages of sixteen and twenty who are unable to find employment. The opportunity should be afforded these boys to spend the three months of the summer vacation in a camp similar to the CCC Camp, where they would be taught to work with their hands through building roads, bridges, and other types of constructive manual labor. This coördination of the high school, the NYA, and the CCC Camp should have as its chief objective the *educational* preparation of youth in both urban and rural environment. The requirement of economic need should give place to educational and social needs of the youth involved. Unless the management and control of the high school and the NYA-CCC Camp combination were set up with definite educational objectives and safeguards, few mothers and fathers would be willing for their sons to be enrolled for such work.

The high school and the college or university have not yet been seriously considered as an adjunct to government in our democracy. The development of the high school and the state university have been the result of local and state needs. The private secondary school or college or university has had its source of inspiration in a limited group. In order for the government of our democracy to function to the fullest it is going to be necessary to tie in the high school and the college through civil service into the public service. Each year our high schools and higher institutions turn out a host of promising youth. It is left to the needs of private industry to absorb these graduates. We should make public service a public career, by admitting into public service each year the most promising of the youth graduated. Until we do this the private interests of the country will be best served, while the interests of our country as a whole will be served by the best it can get from those not taken by the private interests.

### Summary

The role then of the city high school in American democracy may be summarized as follows:

1. To acquaint each succeeding wave of youth with the theories of a democratic society;
2. To acquaint them so far as possible with the practices in a democratic society;
3. To help youth acquire the bases for life through discovering his own abilities and applying them through his vocation for the benefit of himself and others;
4. To give youth the aspiration to "seek the pathway of honor, the light of truth, and the will to work for men."

# The Private Denominational School as An Integral Part of American Democracy*

By S. J. McCallie
*Headmaster, The McCallie School, Chattanooga, Tennessee*

Father P. A. Roy, President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, who is also President of Loyola University of New Orleans, has requested me to speak on the topic, "The Private Denominational School as an Integral Part of American Democracy." Two questions naturally arise in our mind when this subject is presented. In the first place, is our democracy in danger? And, secondly, just what part does the private denominational school have in the defense of democracy?

Let us consider this first question. Is American democracy in any danger? My answer to this question arises out of the present world conditions as I see them. I bear in mind the feeling that the year 1940 is to be an unusually eventful and momentous year. For over ten years, I have been reading here and there that 1940 is to be a year of crises for European civilization. I do not know how truly such prognostications are to eventuate, but I do know that the tempo of modern life is unbelievably swift. Just yesterday I read that far more would happen in the next ten years than has happened in the past fifty years. Judging from the present acceleration of world movements, this increase of five-fold speed is a safe and sane prediction. No one doubts that our white or European civilization is skating at tremendous speed on thin ice. Not only is the ice thin, but along the dizzy pathway are countless ventholes. Every now and then before our horrified gaze some country or another crashes to destruction amidst the cracking ice, and long streamers shooting out in all directions clearly warn the rest of us that none has complete security.

Four hundred years ago, proud Spain was the undisputed monarch of all Europe and none dared dispute her sway. Not even of today is there a country so extensive or possessing such supremacy as was true of the great empire of Charles V. It was but yesterday that you, that I, saw Spain sink into the chasm of national suicide. Not in one hundred years or even more will Spain emerge from her present bloody shambles. It is fearful enough to see a government disintegrate and go down, but it is even more alarming to behold ideals, religious convictions, ethical norms, that have been held as inviolate and eternal, shattered into a thousand pieces and disappear almost overnight.

In the year of our Lord, 1914, the great Russian Empire was devoutly a religious country, holding to the tenets of the Greek Catholic Church. Ev-

* An address delivered over radio station WGST, Atlanta, Georgia, April 9, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

ery competent visitor to Russia testified that the Russians were an unusually religious people. Not thirty years have elapsed since that time, but in this short period of time we have seen the largest nation on Earth turn almost overnight to atheism—an incredible change.

We have seen Germany, the home and birthplace of the great modern universities, the leader in invention and in chemistry, turn from a fairly liberal monarchy to an intensely illiberal Nazism. We have seen artistic and musical Italy suddenly shift from an easy-going inefficiency into an intense regimentation of extremely efficient but brutal Fascism. Time forbids elaboration of kindred movements, but from the four corners of the Earth comes corroborating evidence that cataclysmic changes are taking place all around us.

Why do I bring these things up? It is because as never before we do need to re-evaluate our own form of government, we need to scrutinize our own national philosophy. If others are suffering disastrous changes, we also may suffer from them. My answer then to our first question, "Is American democracy in any danger?" is that "It can happen here." Troubles and disaster can come and will come to countries that become complacent and lethargic.

Our second question is: where does the private denominational school come into the picture as a defender of American democracy? May I be allowed to tell my radio audience at this juncture that I am not connected with a denominational school, but that I am the headmaster of a private or independent school for boys. Nevertheless, I feel as if I am in position to speak on the subject assigned me, since the school I represent stands for the same fundamental principles of Christianity as does the denominational school. Therefore, I ask you to bear in mind that though I am speaking from the experiences of a private or independent school, I speak representing all secondary schools both independent and denominational, that have as their fundamental philosophy man's personal relationship to his Creator.

Democracy is a big word and carries with it so many meanings that it will be impossible for you and me in the time allotted to us to discuss fully its import. I think it necessary, therefore, that we limit our discussion to that meaning of democracy in which the independent and denominational schools render the greatest service. Democracy taken in its objective sense is a framework of government such as is found in our own United States of America, such as is found in Switzerland, Finland, France, etc. Democracy taken in a subjective sense is a religious ideal and an intellectual conviction that gives breath to the framework; therefore, in speaking of democracy as an ideal and as a conviction we speak of the fountainhead which makes possible democracy in action in a given framework.

Without these ideals, without these convictions, there can be no true democracy, no lasting democratic form of government. It is in upholding,

disseminating, and cherishing religious ideals and conviction of democracy that the denominational school and the independent school render the greatest service. Whether wisely or not, it is not my purpose to discuss, but the state has so circumscribed and limited the state schools that it is impossible for them to give full scope to the dissemination of democracy as a religious ideal. The state schools, therefore, are curtailed to the maintaining of democracy as an intellectual and worthwhile fundamental of life. The independent and denominational schools are left free to explore the very fountainheads of democracy, which in the last source are religious and find their expression in the eternal verities of freedom of worship, freedom of thought, and, as a consequence, freedom of speech in the limits defined by decency and truth.

Due to the decline of religious training in the home, it is more and more being left to the independent and denominational schools and the church to give to the individual the fundamental concept of democracy—the personal relationship of the individual to his creator, and his responsibilities that arise under that relationship. Unhampered by state regulations, free from all restrictions, the independent and denominational schools are granted the wonderful privilege of giving to their students religious concepts of democracy that are immutable and unchanging, however much the interpretations and applications may change. It is this very privilege and this very opportunity that make the denominational and independent schools such an integral part of American democracy. Governmental frameworks may change, forms may come and go, but the schools that are founded upon the Word of God will continue to instruct youth entrusted to their care in the unchangeable fundamentals inherent in man's responsibilities to his Maker. The student brought up to revere the framework, or whose basis of democracy is purely intellectual, is deprived of this deeper and firmer conviction. He is more liable to be swept away from his buoy and to change his convictions than is one who has been given the religious basis of democracy. This is strikingly illustrated by what has taken place in Germany in the last few years.

May I quote Professor Einstein, who has been recently run out of Germany, because of his convictions? I quote: "Being a lover of freedom, when the revolution came in Germany, I looked to the universities to defend it, knowing that they had always boasted of their devotion to the cause of Truth; but no, the universities were immediately silenced. Then I looked to the individual writers who as literary guides of Germany had written much and often concerning the place of freedom in modern life; but they, too, were mute. Only the church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing truth. I never had any great interest in the church before, but now I feel a great affection and admiration, because the church alone has had the courage and persistence to stand for intellectual truth and

moral freedom. I am forced to confess that what I once despised I now praise unreservedly." Dr. Einstein in the statement above renders great praise to the fact that the religious conviction is far more stable than is the intellectual. What Einstein has found true in Germany, has been found true in other countries. Russia, Italy, and Spain are outstanding examples. Whenever it has been to the interests of those in charge of the governmental framework to change its form and deprive men of religious liberty and other essentials of democracy, they have found it necessary to oppose the church and the schools that uphold the viewpoint of the church. Wherever there is a truly democractic government, there exist the church schools and independent schools—England, France, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, and our own United States are testimonials to this statement. Wherever the government is totalitarian, there are no independent schools—Italy, Germany, and Russia are sufficient examples. Fascism, Nazism, Bolshevism have no place for religious education, no room for an independent school.

The heart of the anti-democratic or totalitarian state is intense regimentation, the suppression of individualism, the total disregard of minorities. The anti-democratic states allow free speech to the utmost so long as it is "Heil Hitler!" or "Bravo Mussolini!" or "Long live Stalin!" Worship is allowed provided it is along the lines of national dictates. Every foreign visitor to our country from de Tocqueville and Lord Bryce down to the present time have said that the danger in America will come from too much power intrusted to a popular leader backed by an overwhelming majority of the people. In short, so long as there exists a respect for minorities, so long as the rights of independent groups are not destroyed, democracy will be safe. I happen to be a Presbyterian in religion and a Democrat in politics, but I would hate to see this country solidly attached to these two organizations. Minority groups, minority organizations, minority schools, are indeed the distinguishing features of a true democracy. The danger comes from subversive elements of society and not from minorities as such.

Just recently we were treated to a spectacle in which members of the American Youth Congress bitterly attacked the President of the United States and booed at every resolution offered that favored Finland and cheered every favorable reference to Russia. This group of young people in the main are the products of state schools and are not the products of religious education. The evidence is quite clear that in many of our publicly controlled institutions professors are busily engaged in attacking religion and democracy. They are responsible for the Communist ideals and practices that are creeping into our schools and colleges. They bitterly fight denominational and independent schools that hold to a philosophy of religious education. They realize quite clearly that it is in the schools that teach democracy as a religious ideal that they meet their greatest resistance. Martyrs are produced by religious convictions, rarely if ever from intellectual beliefs. It is

in the church and church schools that the future of American democracy lies.

Our Lord, in the Parable of the Talents, as found in Matthew, 25th chapter, best illustrates what I have been talking about. He clearly teaches that men have varying talents but all are expected to have definite responsibilities and that all must give an account of the talent given them. In many state controlled schools there is creeping in at present a philosophy directly contradictory to Our Lord's teachings. These schools proclaim that the students must not be failed, all must pass. If the pupil seems to be trying, he should be graded on his assumed effort and not on the actual work produced. To fail a student is to create an inferiority complex, it is to create class distinctions, it is not democratic. Our Lord, however, who was the greatest democrat who ever lived, whom the poor and sinners heard gladly, did not hesitate to say in regard to the man failing to produce: "Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents." The process today is the reverse of this in too many instances. I stand for the schools of all types, denominational, independent, and state controlled, that preach and practice a democracy of work and of rewards commensurate with the work. May America never lack schools founded upon these principles.

# Teachers as Leaders in our Democracy*

By Sam H. Whitley
*President, East Texas State Teachers College*

Democracy in the United States has always had its leaders. They have come from all ranks and vocations of life: politics, law, medicine, business, the ministry, farmers, and teachers have all furnished their quota of leaders in our democracy. Other democratic nations have likewise furnished their quota of leaders in democracy. It is my privilege and pleasure this morning to discuss with the radio audience of WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, "Teachers as Leaders in Our Democracy in the United States."

One has quite a task when he attempts to review the past and select from that great assemblage or galaxy of brilliant or noted persons classed as educators the names of the five or six who stand out as most influential on democracy. In every century and in almost every great nation such leaders have arisen on the horizon to make a contribution of lasting benefit to the betterment of mankind and building of democracy. In this brief message, the name of only one such educator who lived outside the United States, Rousseau, will be mentioned.

Rousseau began his tragic career in the city of Geneva in the year 1712, the offspring of mixed, but highly respectable, parentage. His life and character were a supreme paradox; he was a creature of prodigious emotionalism and uncontrollable passions. He led the growing revolt against the artificiality and degeneracy of civilization in the eighteenth century. He pointed out the changes he thought necessary in the state, church, marriage, family life, and school, in order to bring them all back to the fundamental principles of nature. The *Social Contract* opens with the declaration: "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains." Liberty and equality constituted the two principal objects of government. The state exists by virtue of "the general will," which is the universal good. Laws are but an expression of this common interest, and ought to be enacted only with the consent of the governed—the people.

Rousseau formulated the principles of the new education. He gave to the world a new point of view from which to approach the training of the young. He assailed the basic assumption that education should be determined and organized from the viewpoint of adult interests and adult social life, and substituted the spontaneous interests and activities of the child and its natural course of development. Every great educator from Rousseau's day down to the present, including Froebel, Pestalozzi, Herbart, and John Dewey, has sided with Rousseau in this new point of view. They, with

* An address delivered over radio station WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

Rousseau, have recognized the false assumption of the adult point of view. "All things are good as they come from the hands of the author of nature; in the hands of man, all things degenerate." This statement, found in Rousseau's *Emile*, epitomizes Rousseau's philosophy with reference to the nature of man and has become the philosophy of people in democratic countries throughout the world.

In the United States, one of the great leaders of democracy was Horace Mann. Universal education free from political or sectarian bias was his main theme. It is in the field of universal education that his supreme work was done. Perhaps his greatest contribution was the establishment in the minds of the American people the conception that education should be universal, non-sectarian, and free, and that its aim should be social efficiency, civic virtue, and character, rather than mere learning or the advancement of sectarian ends. Merely listing the problems which came within the compass of his attention shows the scope of his interests and his breadth of vision. He urged grouping pupils into classes, advocated compulsory school attendance, inaugurated a system of school registers, suggested better school supervision, enlarged the administrative unit by battling against the district school system, apportioned school funds on the basis of the average attendance of pupils, secured the legislature's assent to legislation making it possible to establish school libraries, lengthened the school term, centralized the schools, arranged school conventions for patrons and friends of education, encouraged the employment of women as teachers in the lower grades, foresaw the pre-eminent need for good teachers and through normal schools and teacher's institutes sought to make them skilled, and organized county teachers' associations. Uniform textbooks were adopted for the towns. State aid was provided for all schools. He organized the first three state normal schools in America. His philosophy in brief of society and democracy is well expressed in the following quotations:

"The wealth of the state should educate the children of the state."

"On schools and teachers, I rely more than on any other earthly instrumentality for the prosperity and honor of the state, and for the reformation and advancement of the race."

"We cannot drive our people up a dark avenue, even though it be the right one; but we must hang the lights of starry knowledge about it, and show them not only the directness of its course to the goal of prosperity and honor, but the beauty of the way that leads to it."

"I beseech you to treasure up in your hearts these my parting words: Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."

"Finally, education alone can conduct us to that enjoyment which is, at once, best in quality and infinite in quantity."

"The common school is the greatest discovery ever made by men."

"The whole land must be watered with the streams of knowledge. It is not enough to have, here and there, a beautiful fountain playing in palace gardens; but let it come like the abundant fatness of the clouds upon the thirsting earth."

No one can recognize properly the great democratic leaders in the teaching profession in the United States without calling attention to Henry Barnard. He was born in Connecticut, in 1811, and was graduated from Yale in 1830. He is universally recognized as the scholar of American education. He was secretary to the State Board of Commissioners of Common Schools in Connecticut, State Superintendent of Rhode Island, Chancellor of University of Wisconsin, editor of the *American Journal of Education*, president of St. John's College, and the first United States Commissioner of Education.

Some of his outstanding contributions to the cause of education were these: he aroused the public mind to the importance of educational improvement; he was responsible for laws passed in many states which looked to a better organization and administration of public instruction; he was the first to force attention to school architecture; he raised the standards of the teaching profession by making available more literature, by organizing institutes, by establishing normal schools, and by fostering associations; he had a democratic political philosophy of the Jeffersonian mold, which eschewed coercion as a leverage for social reconstruction, and relied on the education of public opinion; his philosophy as to the aims of education was that schools were agencies of social rejuvenation: they must equip the individual with the tools necessary for adjustment to his immediate environment. Barnard's philosophy is best expressed in his own language:

"The state should provide education good enough for the best, and cheap enough for the poorest."

"The cause of true education, of the complete education of every human being, without regard to the accidents of birth or fortune, is worthy of the concentration of all our powers."

Another great leader in the democracy of the United States listed as a teacher is Woodrow Wilson, who was born in 1856 in Staunton, Virginia. He was educated at Princeton, Johns Hopkins, and the University of Virginia. Before becoming President of the United States, Wilson taught history and political economy at Byrn Mawr, Wesleyan, and Princeton University. His struggle for greater democracy in higher education at Princeton had its influence on other colleges. The educational philosophy of Woodrow Wilson is expressed in his work entitled *The State*. He thought the state approached democracy in direct proportion to the universality of its education, and that education becomes universal just to the degree to

which it is regarded as one of the functions of the state. The following are a few of his discerning comments on his social theory and on democratic education:

"It is the proper object of the family to mold the individual, to form him in the period of immaturity in the faiths of religion and in the practice of morality and obedience. This period of subordination over, he is called out into an independent, self-directive activity. The ties of family affection still bind him, but they bind him with silken, not with iron bonds."

"Education is the proper office of the state for two reasons. . . . Popular education is necessary for the preservation of those conditions of freedom, political and social, which are indispensable to free individual developments. And, in the second place, no instrumentality less universal in its power and authority than government can secure popular education."

Then there is the man who, unlike nearly every other historically prominent figure, has lived to see contemporary generations write of and affirm his own greatness. Few men in history's annals have had such privilege. But John Dewey has had and is having this rare experience. That he is able to do this is but confirmation of the greatness of the man and his philosophy. Dr. Dewey has been one of the foremost educational leaders of America for more than forty years. His name is mentioned here because he is regarded as the greatest philosophic thinker the new world has produced. His discussions of educational problems have exercised a profound influence on schools throughout the world. His students and followers have spread his fame as a philosophic thinker and educational reformer to foreign countries. His writings are voluminous, and the range of contributions to educational literature is astounding. His works *Democracy and Education* and *School and Society* probably have not been equaled in this country in the extent of their influence on educational theory and practice. Dewey has pointed out the necessity of connecting the work and other activities of the school with the work and other activities of life outside the school and of giving children and youth an intelligent understanding of the world in which they live. Throughout his conspicuously influential career as philosopher and educational leader, he has held that real education must be based upon the nature of the child, that the mind is a process, a growing affair, that one learns to do by doing, to think by seeking to solve real problems and not by formal exercises in logic. His philosophy of the democracy of education is effectively expressed in the following quotation:

"Government, business, art, religion, all social institutions have a meaning, a purpose. That purpose is to set free and to develop the capacities of human individuals without respect to race, sex, class or economic status. And this is all one with saying that the test of their value is the extent to which they educate every individual into the full stature of his possibility.

Democracy has many meanings, but if it has a moral meaning, it is found in resolving that the supreme test of all political institutions and industrial arrangements shall be the contribution they make to the all-around growth of every member of society."

Another example of democratic leadership is an outstanding character in American Education at the present time, Dr. Alexander Jerry Stoddard, Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and chairman of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Educational Association. This statement will help to reveal his philosophy of democracy, or democracy in education: "The only reasonably sure protection that our country can have in these tragic days is a general understanding on the part of our people of the principles for which democracy stands, an appreciation of the sacred significance of these principles, an ability and a willingness to apply them in the every-day affairs of life, and a consecrated determination to preserve them regardless of the cost."

It is with great pleasure that tribute is paid this morning to another great living American educator, Dr. W. A. Sutton, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, who is one of the great leaders in American democracy. He was born in Dansburg, Georgia, and attended Emory College and Vanderbilt and Columbia universities. He has long been a great leader in democratic education, believing as he does that education of the right kind should be made available to all the children of all the people. Time will permit me to quote only one statement expressing the philosophy of this great educator: "Every child has within him some quality, which, if brought to light, would bless the world; and I can think of no higher mission than that of seeking to discover those divine attributes and bringing them to fulfillment."

If time permitted, attention could be called to other great leaders in education who have contributed materially to the preservation of democracy. This is especially true of the great leaders of education in the Southern Association, among whom should be listed the late Chancellor James H. Kirkland, of Vanderbilt University. He was one of the greatest educators to hold an educational position in the Vanderbilt University. His leadership for the cause of democracy and educational opportunities was unmatched in his day and generation.

I cannot close this broadcast without paying tribute to the vast army of workers in education who have done yeoman service in establishing and preserving the ideals of democracy in the United States. Reference is made here to the great body of classroom teachers found in the public schools of the United States. They have taught successive generations of children the importance of preserving those priceless heritages of democracy which should always be kept in mind; namely freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of all classes of people to organize for the purpose of insuring better

living conditions, and freedom to discuss and vote upon public issues. In my humble opinion, no class of leaders in our democracy has rendered more conspicuous and more outstanding service than the classroom teachers of the United States.

# Youth Builds Character for Life in Our Democracy*

By M. E. Ligon
*Professor of Secondary Education, University of Kentucky*

Character is an abstract term applied to an intangible urge within an individual which determines his thinking, speech, and behavior. The character of an individual is evaluated by his attitudes and behavior. If these attitudes and actions conform to the standards established by society for right conduct, the character of the individual is pronounced good. If these attitudes and actions violate the standards of society, they are pronounced bad. The character of individuals composing society will vary from the perfect individual at one extreme to the totally depraved individual at the other extreme. The character of the great bulk of individuals will fall somewhere between these extremes.

Character is an acquired attribute. Native ability and environment determine to a large degree the acquisition of character. Society, therefore, is concerned with the agencies that influence the developing youth in his formative years. The first contacts are made in the home. Proper habits of taking food, sleep, exercise, and elimination can be developed before the child is able to care for himself. These in turn tend to develop mental and physical health. The character of the parents and others in the home is the environment in which the child grows. If love, sacrifice, peace, courtesy, and honorable work abound, the atmosphere is conducive to the development of desirable attitudes and behavior. If, on the other hand, there is quarreling, nagging, lying, and lack of the common virtues, the home is not making a worthy contribution to the development of character.

The church must make its contribution to the proper growth of character. The desirable traits of character grow out of the religion of a people. American society is founded upon the fundamental philosophy and teachings of Christ. The man of perfect character is found in the person of Christ. The Ten Commandments form the bed-rock of Christian civilization. These are supplemented by the personal sayings of Christ. Youth who grow up in this atmosphere and absorb this philosophy are not likely to depart from it.

The school has been established by society to supplement the work of the home and the church. The school is to teach those things which cannot be taught well by the home and by the church. The school has assumed and is accomplishing these tasks so well that society has been delegating more and more tasks to this institution. The day in school is spent in study, play, recreation. The midday meal is provided at school. Literally, the children live, move, and have their being in the school. Society demands that men and women of unimpeacheable character teach and administer the affairs

* An address delivered over radio station WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

of the school. This demand is just if the school is to supplement the home in providing a wholesome place for the development of high ideals of behavior.

Everyday community environment is another powerful factor in providing for the growth and development of character. Every community should provide a wholesome setting for the recreational life of youth. The picture show, night clubs, roadhouses, gambling halls, etc., are found in every community, and little or no effort is made by the community to see to it that they are places of wholesome recreation and not dens of iniquity. It is as natural for the young people to play and seek amusement as it is to eat food. Wholesome amusement and recreation contribute to moral and spiritual health.

The youth of our democratic nation grow to maturity under the influence and direction of the institutions named above which are surrounded by the environment provided by the community. These institutions should be preserved and encouraged by our democratic form of government to render the optimum of service in the training of our youth in right conduct. Our young people of today are as fine quality as at any time in the history of our country, but the conditions under which they grow to maturity are the most complicated. About four million of our young people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-four are unemployed. I can think of nothing that will break morale so quickly as this condition. All of the agencies of our democracy should be marshalled to the solution of this problem.

The schools have been criticized severely by recent writers for the behavior of our young people. A good example of this criticism is that of Walter Lippman in his discussion of the American Youth Congress held in Washington recently. Some of his phrases were: "They lacked the charm of youth"; they were "shockingly ill-mannered, disrespectful, conceited, ungenerous, and spoiled"; they were in Washington "to tell the country what it owed them, but scarcely a word was uttered about what they owed the country." Mr. Lippman's pointed criticism of the schools is in the following words:

> "What is serious about this is not the nature of these opinions but what has been revealed about how, as a result of recent theories of education, this new generation, or at least an articulate part of it, has learned to form its opinions. So-called progressive education is based on the notion that if you remove authority, and discipline, and tradition, in the up-bringing of young people, the unobstructed natural goodness of their hearts and minds will by spontaneous creation, bring them to good ideas.
>
> "The fact is, however, that if you remove authority and discipline and tradition, what you make is an unsatisfied need, a vacuum, which is then filled by another tradition and by another form of authority. Thus you emancipate the young from the alleged tyranny of their own elders, and, before you know it, they are hypnotized by an alien tyranny. You teach them to believe that their

> own moral and political and religious tradition is an outworn idolatrous superstition, and before you say Jack Robinson, they are worshipping the idols set up elsewhere."

Mr. Lippman's criticism of the conduct of these young people is just. My criticism of Mr. Lippman is that he placed the condition for the conduct of these young people upon the schools. I contend that his criticism is narrow. He should have included the home, the church, business, government, and local environment. All of these factors are at work outside the school. Frequently, the failure of these agencies to assume their full share in the development of character more than counterbalances the efforts of the school. The development of character in individuals is a coöperative enterprise of all the agencies of the community.

Every business man and parent should read J. Edgar Hoover's article, "Criminals are Home Grown," in the April issue of the *Rotarian*. This article should impel business men and parents to action. In the course of this article Mr. Hoover says:

> "Criminals are home grown. So are law-abiding, honorable citizens. Character, good or bad, gets its original 'set' at the dinner table, in front of the living-room fire, in the basement workshop or playroom, even perhaps in the woodshed—wherever parents and their children meet, live with one another, react on one another. Very few parents consciously and wilfully instill criminal ideals in their youngsters. Criminal tendencies and habits are mostly picked up outside of the home, perhaps on the street—because of a lack of proper teaching in the home, but boys seek the street and the outside, and become receptive to the criminal ideas and ideals of tough pals or gangs, usually for just one reason; somehow, whether because of indifference, ignorance, laziness, or stupidity, the home and parents have failed."

Every person interested in the work of the church should read the editorial in a recent issue of *Fortune Magazine*, entitled "The Light That Failed." This editorial was repeated in the March issue of *The Reader's Digest*. In that editorial the failure of the church to meet its responsibilities is portrayed by the writer in terms that should make clergy and laymen alike resolve anew to restore the church to its proper place in our democratic life. Mr. Richard Wright, in his recent novel, *A Native Son*, portrays the story of one of the vilest criminals in our annals. The burden of Mr. Wright's theme is that this criminal was the product of his environment. Mr. Wright's description of the life of the tenements of one section of his great city, Chicago, is not only a reflection on the living conditions of the people of that section but on the living conditions of many sections in many parts of our democracy. Such stories should provoke thought and action in the improvement of such conditions.

The story of political corruption in Kansas City is still fresh in our minds. This sort of thing has happened over and over again in our federal, state,

and local government. What kind of influence are these conditions producing on the character of the youth who grow up in the midst of them?

Thus the story goes. I return to my theme, that character training in a democracy is a coöperative enterprise. The home, the church, the school, government, business, and all allied activities must renew their efforts to provide better conditions for building ideals of right conduct.

There is abundant evidence all about us which indicates that we realize the importance of providing better conditions for our young people to realize their ideals of the good life. The American Youth Commission of the American Council on Education published the results of its extensive study of youth in 1937. The American Association of School Administrators devoted its sixteenth yearbook, 1938, to *Youth Education Today*. The National Youth Administration of the federal government is providing aid to thousands of students making it possible for them to continue in school. The Conservation Corps Camps of the federal government have rendered aid to thousands of young men. These camps have given these men an opportunity to do useful work in the conservation of our natural resources. The Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and many similar organizations of the churches and of civic bodies are rendering valiant service. The Parent-Teachers Association is bringing the parents and teachers together in their attack upon the common problem of training youth in ways of right conduct.

Local school communities must realize that the work of the school must be supplemented by all the groups interested in the moral and spiritual training of the youth of the community. Personally, I believe the schools have been doing a better part by the young people than other groups in the community. However, all of us in our great democracy can subscribe to and work for the development of such men as Josiah Gilbert Holland pictured in the following lines:

> God give us men. The time demands
> Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
> Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
> Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
> Men who possess opinions and a will;
> Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
> Men who can stand before a demagogue
> And dam his treacherous flatteries without winking;
> Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
> In public duty and in private thinking.

# May Academic Freedom Become an Instrument of Subversive Propaganda?*

By Andrew C. Smith, S.J.
*Dean, Spring Hill College*

The question of academic freedom is very much to the fore today. More than once of late the public, through patriotic organizations and legislative bodies, individually as well as collectively, has manifested a very legitimate interest in the great public business of education by criticism of the views and teaching of certain educators, and these in their turn have replied either personally or through groups by an appeal to "academic freedom," as to some shibboleth that dispenses with all further argument. The suspicion has accordingly risen in many minds that academic freedom may be really nothing else than a convenient Trojan horse cunningly devised for the introduction into the citadel of our liberties, ideas eventually destructive of the very bases of society. It would seem to some that nowadays all one has to do in order to be a subversive propagandist with immunity is to get himself a chair in one of our larger seats of learning. After that he can take pot-shots at the government, religion, and morality, and no one can do anything about it because doing anything would be an infringement of academic freedom.

Obviously this is a serious distortion of the true concept of a noble thing. Academic freedom, however much it may be abused by a few of its proponents and many of its opponents, is something in the long run beneficial to society, something worth safeguarding from its friends as well as from its foes. Fundamentally it is a right which the teaching profession holds for the better achievement of its purpose, the enlightenment of society, and like all human rights it has its limitations and implies correlative duties. This is trenchantly expressed in the finest official statement I know of, that adopted this January by the Association of American Colleges. I quote the preamble:

> Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good, and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. It carries with it duties correlative with rights.[1]

---

* An address delivered over radio station WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

[1] *Bulletin, Association American Colleges*, March, 1940, p. 106.

So long as these general principles are kept clearly in view it is my contention that the charter of academic freedom is safe; safe to guarantee to investigators and teachers that feeling of security, that elbow-room they need to do their great work with alertness and confidence; safe likewise to guarantee to society that its legitimate bases, religious, political, moral, and economic, will not be undermined by the ill-considered utterances of academic exhibitionists and intellectual anarchists. For teachers are reminded that as their cherished freedom is based on their particular function in society, it is likewise subordinate to the good of society; and that if academic freedom is a right, then like all rights it has its limitations and its responsibilities. The distinguished teacher and historian, Charles A. Beard, has summed the matter up thus:

> The right of a teacher, like that of the citizen in general, is not absolute. There is no such thing as an absolute right. Rights are relative and particular. They are subject more or less to law and custom. Nobody can honestly claim a right to say what he pleases, where he pleases, and any way he pleases. Even the most ardent apostle of liberty will not admit that anybody has a right to shout "fire" at a crowded theater for the purpose of raising a false alarm and "seeing the fun." A right is something limited by law and custom, and is effective only so far as law and custom will protect it.[2]

The notion of academic freedom so conceived should be as utterly foreign to whatever can reasonably be classed under the rubric of subversive propaganda as the notion of freedom is to that of anarchy. Like freedom of speech, of which it is only an extension, it is a freedom *under law*, and therefore a freedom endangered by everything that threatens that law, whether it be conceived as the natural law, the law of God, or the law of the American constitution. There is something mildly ironical in the spectacle not unknown today of speakers, be they teachers or others, confidently appealing to their right of free speech to justify their attacks on the very instrument which alone guarantees them the freedom they postulate. The ordinary reaction of the man in the street to such tactics is well illustrated by these ringing words of a great publicist, Walter Lippmann:

> No man may invoke a right in order to destroy it. The right of free speech belongs to those who are willing to preserve it. The right to elect belongs to those who mean to transmit that right to their successors. The rule of the majority is morally justified only if another majority is free to reverse that rule. To hold any other view is to believe that democracy alone of all forms of government is prohibited by its own principles from insuring its own preservation. There is nothing in the principles of democracy that requires a people to surrender democracy or relieves them of the obligation to defend it. In many of the countries of the world today there are armed bands of men, using the democratic liberties of free assemblage and of free speech for the overthrow of democratic liberties. Is there any doubt that democratic governments have the right to suppress them?[3]

[2] *Social Frontier*, March, 1935.
[3] *New York Herald-Tribune*, February 5, 1935.

Such a view may seem to the extreme proponents of academic freedom to canonize the *status quo*, making it impossible to criticize our present form of government, and thus barring the door to legitimate experimentation in new forms of social organization. A summary answer to this from one of our earnest but not always far-sighted patriotic organizations would be: "What of it? We are thoroughly satisfied with the government, and we don't relish the idea of professors or others finding fault or tinkering with it." In extenuation of such a view, as long as it remains on the academic plane and does not proceed to acts of intolerance, it may be admitted that the professorate has not been particularly happy in its contributions to the theory and practice of government. But on the other hand we are not to be blamed for trying, and criticism, particularly if it be honest and constructive, may well be the beginning of improvement. Certainly all criticism is not to be construed as subversive propaganda, and we can value the Constitution without supposing that it is perfect. The important thing about criticism, as about freedom for that matter, is that it must get us somewhere. It must advance us towards a desirable end, and it must do it in a legitimate way.

There is enough analogy between the possible conduct of politically-minded teachers and the recent antics of the American Youth Congress to justify the quotation here of President Roosevelt's reported warning: "As Americans you have a right, a legal and constitutional right to call yourselves Communists . . . but you have no American right by act or deed of any kind to subvert the government and the constitution of this nation." There are doubtless many in this country who would go further than the President in this regard, and outlaw the Communists, whatever be their peaceful and patriotic protestations. I am frank to admit that personally I sympathize with this viewpoint, but I see certain dangers in its immediate and wholesale application. The term Communist, like its obverse Fascist, is a label too easily plastered on those whose economic views are somewhat out of line with the prevailing majority of the moment. In the long run it is always better to be over-tolerant than unjust. As a definable limit to freedom of speech, academic or otherwise, subversive propaganda is by far the most practical norm. For one reason, it has been defined by the Supreme Court. I quote from the decision in the Gitlow Case, in 1925:

> It is a fundamental principle, long established that the freedom of speech and of the press which is secured by the Constitution does not confer an absolute right to speak or publish, without responsibility, whatever one may choose, or an unrestricted and unbridled license that gives immunity for every possible use of language, and prevents the punishment of those who abuse this freedom. That a state in the exercise of its police power may punish those who abuse this freedom by utterances inimical to the public welfare, tending to corrupt public morals, incite to crime, or disturb the public peace is not open to question.[4]

[4] *Constitutional Review*, October, 1925.

To this interpretation of subversive and therefore forbidden propaganda it is hardly doubtful that the rank and file of teachers can subscribe without feeling that they are thereby sacrificing academic freedom. Certainly this minimum is desirable for the vindication of the profession before the public. To go further in definition and restriction is scarcely possible in the prevailing fog of liberalism that hangs over everything connected with individual rights. A better solution of the problem may some day be reached when men will agree again on these seemingly rational but today much disputed assumptions:

1. That truth on many points is something fixed, and determinible;
2. That this truth has preferential rights to expression, not to be granted falsehood and error.

Meanwhile there is need for tolerance between both parties to the dispute, the town and the gown, so to speak. The public, whether represented by the man in the street or the college administrator, must be prepared to put up with the vagaries and crotchets of certain professors who are groping their way towards the truth, sometimes through byways of error, not strictly subversive propaganda. And the teachers for their own protection and the preservation of their self-respect must be scrupulously objective in their teaching, and careful to distinguish their utterances as private citizens from their statements as members of the academic community. Then we are likely to have more teachers like Mr. Chips, sincerely devoted to learning and youth, and slightly fewer prophets of the rostrum, who feel that the world is out of joint and they are born to set it right.

# Leadership or Regimentation in Higher Education?*

By W. J. McConnell
*President, North Texas State Teachers College*

A famous American citizen, while serving as President of the Republic of Texas, declared that "cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy and, when guided by virtue, is the only dictator that free men acknowledge and the only security that free men desire."

Assuming that liberal education is the means by which the cultivated mind is developed and made to function effectively in a democracy, the question assigned to me for discussion resolves itself into a judgment as to the relative merits of a system of higher education which would leave colleges and universities free to attempt the designing by creative thought and experimentation of a new type of institution of higher learning, better adapted to the demands of the world of tomorrow, as contrasted with a system which would encourage a lock-step conformity to preconceived patterns which in effect perpetuate the traditions of yesterday. Implicit in the subject is also the question as to whether democracy is best served by a policy within the individual college or university which leaves the superior student free to travel at a pace faster than or in a direction different from that of his fellow students, as contrasted with one which manifests itself in the regimentation of the intellectually inferior, the mediocre, and the superior of its student-body.

It is probably granted by most school administrators that accrediting agencies have been instrumental in elevating standards of many inferior institutions by citing such institutions to common practices of superior ones. Without such agencies, many colleges and secondary schools would have continued to exist without the urge or the guidance essential to improvement. Without them the ever-increasing transfer of students would have been attended by unsurmountable obstacles. Stronger faculties, better libraries, and improved financial support usually mark the efforts of colleges, universities, and secondary schools to qualify for advanced ratings. These changes are in the main to be regarded as desirable.

It is a matter of concern to some, however, lest there be inherent in even a voluntary association of superior institutions a tendency to be content with conformity to "standards" handed down from above and with contentment to fail to keep abreast of the changing society which schools are designed to serve.

Students of the history of civilization concur in the conviction that the power of creative thought belongs to but a small fraction of the population

* An address delivered over radio station WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

of the world or of any race or nation at any given time. Thomas Carlyle speaking of his native land once said, "The population . . . is thirty million souls, mostly fools." His writings show that by this he meant to say what another has said, that "few men or women of any generation will ever strike with the flint of genius from the steel of learning the sparks that are needed to kindle anew the onward-moving torch of civilization."

Although leaders are rare and followers are numerous, it must be recognized that good followers are just as essential to educational progress as good leaders. The two are correlative. Moreover, a certain amount of regimentation is essential to good following. It is of primary importance in a democracy, however, that regimentation should never be allowed to become so rigid as to prevent potential leadership from arising from the ranks of those who follow. This is as important when applied to the members of an association of colleges and universities as when applied to individuals within a given institution. Democracy is superimposed upon the fundamental principle that the individual, whatever his potentialities, should be accorded an opportunity to rise to the full exercise of those potentialities. A university president recently said that "the requirements and purposes of the democratic way of life are met if the road is kept open." I would go a step further by saying that in a democracy the right to open up a *new road* must ever remain inviolate, even down to the ranks of those that are regimented.

Society has always tended to force into line those who would stray from that which is conventional. Present-day known facts of the universe were once only theories, and advocacy of these theories was rewarded with mental or physical torture or death. Crucifixion has over and over again been the reward of many beside the Christ of the Bible who have dared to have unconventional thoughts. Departure from that which is conventional, as well as conformity to it, may at times be the road to better things. The mutation has been quite as potent as a factor in the evolution of social institutions as it has been in the improvement of the species in plant and animal life. It is therefore important that the individual variation from the norm by institution or student be afforded an opportunity to prove whether it possesses survival value. The stone which the builder rejects may today, as it did two thousand years ago, become the head of the corner.

The world of 1940 is in a state of chaos. This we all admit. Two major catastrophes within a generation have stimulated the questioning mind to wonder if some of our social institutions are not sadly in need of rejuvenation or at least of reorientation. Smug complacency is no guarantee of security when destruction is on the march. The industrial world is spending millions of dollars for new ideas through research. One organization alone has budgeted eleven millions for that purpose this year, and such expenditures are producing dividends.

The fact is becoming ever more apparent that our social institutions have

not developed apace with mechanical invention or with industrial development. If they had, such a spectacle of human misery as we behold in world affairs today could not exist. Prevention rather than alleviation and cure is in need of paramount emphasis. Prevention implies forethought and defense; alleviation and cure imply after-thought and re-creation.

One can not emphasize leadership at a time such as this, even with no political implications, without arousing in the minds of one's hearers apprehension lest the leader assume dictatorial power. Such apprehension is but natural when all about us are strewn the wrecks of once prosperous peoples who have been the victims of so-called leaders. Leadership becomes dictatorship, however, only where the power of choice on the part of those who follow ceases to exist—where regimentation is involuntary. In the United States a political leader ceases to be such at the will of its people. Hence, leadership is tolerated only so long as it is acceptable to those who are led.

The Constitution of the United States was ordained and established, among other purposes, to promote the general welfare. Higher education remains a factor in promoting that welfare only so long as it promotes the development of cultivated minds and encourages and fosters leadership. To foster leadership implies a recognition of merit from whatever source it may arise. When regimentation in higher education assumes the proportion of involuntary submission to domination, either by tradition or by minorities, it becomes an agency for the destruction of the fundamental principles on which this nation was founded.

Higher education has the dual responsibility of preserving that rigidity of form essential to the retention of those aspects of culture that should remain constant throughout all ages while preserving that flexibility needed to meet the demands of an ever-changing civilization.

# The Reality of Spiritual Values in Education*

By George J. Flanigen
*Superintendent, Diocesan Parochial Schools, Nashville, Tennessee*

The one supreme treasure of civilization is its youth. The one surpassing value of a nation is the character of its youth. The one essential process for the mind is education. The one essential need of the whole personality is religion. Somehow we must see to it that young persons grow not only in stature and wisdom, but in favor with God and man. They must not only have every facility for developing splendid bodies and alert well-stored minds, but they must also learn how to use these bodies and minds for the welfare of their fellow men and the glory of God. Nothing less than this will suffice.

Education, to be complete, must be of the whole man—physical, intellectual, spiritual. An educational scheme that neglects any of these elements is imperfect and may easily become dangerous. In this country there is small reason to fear that education of the physical and intellectual faculties will be overlooked. The danger is that we shall forget the culture of the spiritual nature. All of our learning and science, our culture and our arts, will be of little avail, unless they are supported by high character; unless there be honor, truth, and justice; unless our material resources are supported by moral and spiritual resources, there is no foundation for progress. A trained intelligence can do much, but there is no substitute for morality, character and religions convictions.

Three processes are embodied in the term Education: sight, insight and action. Herein are contained all the stages of all learning; herein is epitomized all education in all its processes. This is true whether applied to perceiving, understanding, and side-stepping a rattlesnake, or understanding a card game; whether perceiving, understanding, and applying a mathematical formula or a spiritual principle.

Naturally such a conception of education may sound strange to the average man, to whom the word "education" immediately brings up a number of more or less clearly defined implications. To him "going to school" and "getting an education" mean the same thing. The printed page and a mind "debauched by learning," to borrow Bishop Berkeley's famous phrase, go hand in hand. One without the other is inconceivable to the average American, who has become imbued with a worship for education not equaled in any other land. Education, schools, books—this is the holy trinity of desires contained in every good American father's ambition for his boy.

What will the future citizens of America be without a spiritual education as well? How can the affairs of the nation be entrusted to those who are

* An address delivered over radio station WGST, Atlanta, Georgia, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

not God-fearing and upright? And how is our nation to remain a great power among the nations of the world unless we train up a new citizenship today in ideals of justice and righteousness and religion?

Colleges cost money. They must be heavily financed. The amount of money invested in education in America will total a staggering sum, yet there is not a college in the land that has all the money it feels it needs. Is the college worth what it costs? There are probably many who would write a question mark after college values, and point to the fact that many of the most useful and influential men in the country have never been to college. The man on the street is not alone in his skepticism of college values. College men themselves are raising questions. The president of a large Southern college said recently: "College students have three interests—athletics, girls, and religion." He probably named them in the order of their importance on the campus, athletics as the major, religion as the minor, with girls sandwiched in somewhere between. If one asks: "What of the curriculum?" the answer is that the curriculum is not an interest, but an obstacle to be avoided, a disagreeable duty to be shirked as far as possible.

Whether the college is worth what it costs, is worthy of anything at all, depends on its finished product, and its finished product is determined not chiefly by dormitories and the campus, although they are far from negligible in their influence, but by what the student gets in the classroom. If the college is to clear itself of doubt, it must grow men in whose hands the nation is safe. If it will do that, the country will not complain of the cost. The money will be forthcoming. There is enough patriotism in the moneybags of the nation to finance any undertaking that is vital to our country's welfare.

Is the Republic in peril? Indeed, is it in any real need? We are fabulously rich. We are six per cent of the world's population and own half its wealth. If it were for sale, America could go into the highest market and buy the rest of the world—although it is hardly a bargain these days. We have all that goes with an aggressive and prosperous material civilization. We are at peace with mankind. We have as fair a domain as can be found on planet earth, and our people enjoy a measure of personal liberty not surpassed by the people of any other land. Our Government is stable, and our flag is respected wherever it flies. Then why talk about doing anything for the sake of the Republic? Why summon colleges from the football stadium and the fraternity dance to the firing line and ask them to enlist for national defense? Because there is a feeling abroad that all is not as well as it seems. When we begin to investigate, we can discover abundant ground for concern. The glory of America is not her money. "Thy money perish with thee," said Peter to Simon the sorcerer. Trade is great, but after all, trade is only trade. America's greatness is not her forests and mines, her mountains and plains, her populous cities and octopus organizations, her

fertile fields and titanic inland seas and winding continental rivers. Because America's mountains are high and her rivers long and her prairies wide it does not follow that every American is a superman. *The glory of America is the character of her people.* It takes *men* to make a country great. When God climaxed creation, He made a man, and made him in His image, which means, I take it, that man is something more than a collection of nerve cells and blood corpuscles.

Therefore, if we would diagnose the Republic, we must investigate the life of the individual. We must scrutinize Americans. What is going on in the daily activities of the people? There is much that sounds a warning. There is an era of lawlessness such as does not exist anywhere else in the civilized world. This lawlessness is not only tolerated but promoted by the "best people." There is a crime wave staining American history with its darkest page. The feature to cause greatest concern is that the criminals range in age from seventeen to twenty-three years; our juvenile crime record is a national disgrace and tragedy. It misses the mark to say that these criminals were born of the brutalities of war, for the war ended more than twenty years ago, and the criminals of today never saw the brutalities of war.

Another ground for concern is the mood of *materialism* which seems to dominate American life. Our excesses are notorious. Nothing shocks us any more, because the nerve cells which play up such sensations are worn out with repeated debauch.

These are some of the things which say that all is not well with the Republic. One might go further and refer to the disgraceful percentage of divorces to present day marriages. But when one mentions these things with an air of mild censure, he is immediately charged with being out of date, old fashioned, and an old "fogey," if you will pardon the term.

It is not strange to find thoughtful leaders from the President of the United States down sounding the alarm. President Coolidge once called attention to the fact that a large percentage of criminals and outcasts are refugees from broken homes where they were never taught respect for authority. The latest census predictions remind us of tens of millions of men and women who admit no connection with religion. Surely there must be a close connection between this situation and the spirit of lawlessness and the startling increase in crime—particularly juvenile crime.

If this diagnosis be correct, and I believe it is, it follows that if the college is to serve the republic it must grow men of moral fiber. It is not enough to produce scholars, scientists, chemists, engineers, lawyers, doctors, publicists, promoters; it must produce men of moral conviction, who will not sell their country's honor for a drink of liquor or a dollar bill, who will not betray their country on the stock exchange, in the halls of legislation, at the polls, or in some smelly gangster's dive—men whose deepest conviction is that right is right as God is God. Indeed, the moral fiber of citizenship

must reach higher than personal honor and stainless integrity. It must linger long enough at the feet of the Great Teacher to learn the Golden Rule, and discover that it is as binding in the big as in the small relations of life. When we have been just to other nations, we shall have done more to end war than can ever be done by warships and airplanes and standing armies. But the Golden Rule means more than justice. It means the cultivation of international justice. It means the cultivation of international friendships, the substitution of confidence and good will for suspicion and distrust.

If the college is to meet the issue, it must go even further. It must grow a race with moral fiber fine enough to put an accent on service, a race that is educated, but educated for something, people who have culture, but whose culture places them not above their fellows but under their fellow's burdens. Dr. William DeWitt Hyde has an attractive word picture of the college man. He says: "To be at home in all lands and ages, to count nature a familiar acquaintance and art an intimate friend, to gain a standard for the appreciation of other men's work and the criticism of your own, to carry the keys of the world's library in your pocket and feel its resources behind you in whatever you undertake, to make hosts of friends among the men of your own age who are to be leaders in all the walks of life, to lose yourself in generous enthusiasm and coöperate with others for common ends, to learn manners from students who are gentlemen and form character under professors who are Christians—this is the offer of the college for the best four years of your life." The portrait is fine as far as it goes, but is a bit too exclusive, and apart from the common burdens of the world. It is a finer portrait of life given us by the Man of Galilee who said: "I am among you as one that serveth," and again, "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

How, then, is the college to grow men of moral fiber? It must set as its definite objective the education of the heart as well as of the head. It must teach its students to respect authority, to exercise self-control, to achieve self-surrender, to practice the life of service. It must teach them the difference between right and wrong as clearly as the difference between oxygen and hydrogen, the difference between liberty and license as clearly as the difference between brain and muscle. It must develop the moral alongside of the intellectual, so that when there is a mental process it will be accompanied by a corresponding moral process, to which the human will is harnessed as it drives the life. The trouble with the criminal is that he drives only half a team. The upper and lower parts of his brain do not coördinate. He usually knows what he does is wrong, but he does not feel it is wrong. At any rate, he does not feel it sufficiently to keep his hands from crime.

I must confess that I do not see how this moral training can adequately be done apart from religion. I am, of course, ready to grant there are training elements in the study of Latin, Greek, mathematics, the sciences, pro-

LIBRARY
EAST TEXAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
COMMERCE, TEXAS

vided these studies are taught with a moral objective, and that the same is true of athletics and sex relations when directed with a reverent regard for Him who made the body as well as the soul. But moral sanctions and imperatives hark back to religion. If there was no God back of Sinai, the Ten Commandments are not worth the stone they were written on. Atheism is not prolific of moral fiber. Mathematics and the dead languages can never take the place of the truths of the Bible in the making of moral fiber. We have been too timid here in America about giving religious instruction in our schools. Fearing to make them sectarian, we have run the risk of allowing them to become godless.

President Hoover declared that if our country is to improve, it can only come through the influence of religion. In that significant statement, he struck a chord that has vibrated through the nation. With him agree some of the greatest minds of our own and other lands. Washington says: "Of all the dispositions and habits that lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supporters." Daniel Webster says: "Our ancestors founded their system of government on morality and religion. Whatever makes a man a good Christian makes him a better citizen. If the people do not become religious, I do not know what is to become of us as a nation." Burke says: "Religion is the foundation of society and basis on which all true government rests, and from which power derives its authority, laws their efficacy and both their sanction. If it is once shaken by contempt, the whole fabric cannot be stable and lasting." And Lewis Cass says: "Independent of its [religion's] connection with human destiny hereafter, I believe the fate of republican government is indissolubly bound up with the fate of the Christian religion, and that a people who reject its faith will find themselves the slaves of their own passions or of arbitrary power."

In the name, then, of the Republic, I hail our colleges. Our country has nothing to fear, but much to hope from these schools which place the emphasis on moral instruction. Treason and betrayal of trust will never be taught there. A clear and limpid stream flows from such a fountain. As I think of these institutions of life and light I am not pessimistic of America's destiny. The future is not dark. The eastern sky is aglow. Day is back of dawn. We do not need more national development, we need more spiritual development; we do not need more intellectual power, we need more moral power; we do not need more knowledge, we need more character development; we do not need more government, we need more cultural development; we do not need more law, we need more religion; we do not need more of the things that are seen, we need more of the things that are unseen. The childhood of today will be the manhood and womanhood of tomorrow. Religious freedom is not dependent upon the withholding of religious instruction from the young. Such freedom, on the contrary, will find its strongest bulwark in the years to come in what is the childhood of today,

provided always that that childhood is supplied with moral and religious teaching.

A leading magazine has recently outlined the results of a true education as follows. The first result of a true education is Humility. The educated man or woman has no false pride. He does not look down on anyone because of his learning. He knows that he knows very little compared with the great mass of knowledge. He never has finished his education. He is always going to school. The next result of a true education is a Love of Hard Work. No one who is truly educated can be an idler. The word "scholar" in Greek, means a man of "leisure." But no one ever became a scholar by loafing, or living a life of ease. Another result of education is High Ideals, maintained everywhere, in business, politics, amusements, and the home. These ideals will cause losses and gains. But no person is truly educated who lives on a low moral and ethical plane. Another result of a true education is a Clean Life. No bad habits of the sort that make persons disagreeable. Clean of speech, and of conduct. It is a mark of a real educated person if he maintains the same standard for himself that he wants others to maintain.

Character building and moral and religious training constitute the one indestructible heritage. This heritage will prove the most valuable asset in winning success in the big things of life. It will broaden the vision, elevate the purpose, increase the efficiency, enlarge the usefulness, and multiply the joys of life.

# The Outlook for College Women in our Democracy*

By M. R. Hinson
*Professor of Education, Florida State College for Women*

It has been said that fools rush in where angels fear to tread. When a mere man ventures to suggest the probable place of women in our democracy, he is probably rushing foolishly into a controversial area that a wiser head would avoid. Be that as it may, the subject of the college woman's place in our democracy is a peculiarly fitting one for this time and place.

Certainly it seems from the trend of world politics that democratic principles never stood in more need of careful evaluation than at present. Both men and women who love freedom and those inalienable constitutional rights of the individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, should stand by to defend those rights as never before. It is a fitting time to discuss the place of college women in our democracy for another reason also. For just one hundred years ago next July 16, the first college ever chartered to grant bachelors' degrees to women graduated its first class of eleven. Only a little more than a hundred years ago the first woman won a bachelor's degree from any type of institution. And what more fitting place could one find to discuss the place of college women in our democracy than the city of Atlanta, the capital of the state whose legislature issued the charter for the first institution of college rank founded for the exclusive purpose of higher education for women. I refer, of course, to Wesleyan College at Macon chartered as Georgia Female College in 1836.

Although some colleges have been granting degrees to women approximately one hundred years, it was fifty years after the initiation of the practice before any appreciable number of women were being graduated annually from institutions of higher learning. The college world and public opinion were rather slow in accepting the point of view either that women were capable of doing the type of college work planned for men or that women could profit by such training. Even after women had shown, as in the experiment reported by Woody at Harvard[1] about 1880, that they could successfully cope with the same subjects and examinations under the same professors as those taken by men they were given certificates after doing four years of college work rather than bachelors' degrees. All sorts of fantastic arguments were advanced against higher education for women, from its deleterious effects upon their feminine charms to the impairment of their health to such an extent as to lessen their biological ability to bear and nurse

* An address delivered over radio station WGST, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

[1] Woody, Thomas. *A History of Women's Education in the United States*, pp. 307-308.

offspring. It was even suggested that those biological functions were becoming so impaired through the nervous strain of higher education that in fifty years the mothers of our children would have to be imported from Europe.

Higher education for women has had ardent supporters, however, from its very inception. The dire consequences predicted by its opponents have not materialized in the hundred years we have experimented with it in America, nor have its potentialities been anywhere nearly realized in our democracy. Neither have the prejudices against it entirely disappeared. There are still better facilities available for the education of men on the higher and professional levels, and there are still many more men than women enrolled in higher institutions in the United States. The number of both sexes enrolled in higher institutions has increased nearly 350 per cent since 1900. The per cent of increase has been greater for women than that for men. There are at present well over a million students enrolled in colleges of the United States. Approximately 42 per cent of these are women. Between fifty and sixty thousand women are being graduated annually with bachelors' degrees, to say nothing of those receiving graduate and professional degrees.

With this ever increasing army of college women in our midst the question of what role they are to play in our democratic society is very pertinent, though somewhat controversial. Now that women have won the right to college training and have proved themselves in such large numbers capable of competing on equal terms with men in the quest for higher learning, how will they use this education to the advantage both of their sex and of society as a whole?

Certainly I will not agree that such training has unfitted them for the age-old biological function of motherhood. Just the contrary. The college bred woman should be peculiarly fitted to mother the coming generations. She should feel that she is far more capable, if not biologically, certainly socially, mentally and emotionally, to perform the functions of a mother and to teach her children to cherish the precious heritage of democracy than the woman who has not had the advantages of college breeding.

Our college women are obligated, both to themselves and to the democratic social order which gave them the advantages of a college education, to take advantage of the privilege and responsibility of motherhood. Society can ill afford to have its future citizens come from the homes of the underprivileged masses to the extent that would be the case if any large proportion of our college women fail to become wives, mothers, and home makers. If college women fail in this obligation to democracy, God pity its chance of survival. I believe they *do* and will continue to recognize and accept this obligation.

I would not, however, relegate the college-bred woman to the single role

of motherhood. They are and will be, for example, the teachers of our present and coming generations, not only in the homes, but in the public schools and colleges also—though not so much to the exclusion of men in the latter as in the former. Certainly in the profession of teaching college women will continue to find not only an opportunity of earning a livelihood and an outlet for their intellectual and emotional life, but also an opportunity to render one of the most necessary services to democracy. No democracy can hope to exist for long without an intelligent and informed citizenry. Ignorance and freedom are incompatible.

College women in the future will in ever increasing numbers fill places of honor and responsibility in our political life. I am inclined to agree, in part at least, with the thesis that Ida Clyde Clarke maintains in that interesting and challenging, though somewhat feministic, book of hers *Uncle Sam Needs a Wife*. Uncle Sam can ill afford to omit longer the feminine touch in his household affairs. It will be a wholesome influence upon national and world politics when there has occurred considerably more feminine infiltration into the area of our political life than is evident at present. There is no danger of women ever taking over governmental functions in America, but considerable of the feminine touch would certainly do no harm and would in all probability be rather good for us. Certainly the record of women in politics, in so far as they have been tried, compares favorably with that of men—all too favorably perhaps for the vanity of the stronger sex.

Women as a whole have not taken their privileges and responsibilities as voting citizens as seriously as they should. College women have a responsibility both to their sex and to society as a whole to change this attitude. Because of their superior advantages they should assume the leadership in making our women more acutely conscious of their responsibility to democracy in discharging the functions of citizenship and assuming their share of political responsibility. Women are too coy and shy in political matters for the good either of themselves or the body politic.

Women have come a long way in the past century toward gaining parity of rights and privileges in a largely man-made and man-dominated world. At present they control a very large share of our national wealth and are spending a decidedly major part of our national income. Nearly every profession and many of the trades are now open to women, but perhaps not in the same way and in the same degree that they are open to men. Whatever women still lack of having equality of opportunity in positions of leadership and parity in wages, for example, is not altogether due to the opposition of men. Many women still prefer the leadership of men to that of their own sex. Perhaps this will be true for a long time to come. The college women, however, can do much to bring about a change of public opinion and secure any legislation necessary to give women whatever of parity with men women

still lack and desire. Women have the franchise, and political leaders and legislators are keenly aware of the power of the ballot. College women can furnish the leadership to influence women's votes to get whatever women really want, as well as to educate the masses of women to work for and vote for socially desirable ends.

Your speaker is suffering under no illusions that an increased interest in politics on the part of women will bring about the millennium. Two decades of suffrage for women have shown that women vote and think, not as a group but individually, very much as men do. They seem to think about political, social, and moral issues very much as men do. They are not likely to become united as a sex group unless some great cause, in which women are more acutely interested than men, should appear to unite them.

Mrs. Roosevelt in the April issue of *Good Housekeeping* takes the point of view that women love their homes and children with a fervor not equaled by their husbands; that if anything threatens the destruction of the home, women become aroused and will make any sacrifice in its defense. Mrs. Roosevelt suggests that could the women of the world be brought to realize the menace of war to the security of the home, this realization might be a force sufficient to unite them in the common cause of banishing war from the face of the earth.

Women suffer from the curse of war far more than men. Woman united has it within her power to free the world from this curse. What finer challenge could there be to the college women of America than to direct their efforts toward uniting their sex in a crusade against war. I am very much inclined to agree with those who believe that if civilization is saved from destruction through war it must be done by the coöperative efforts of women. In closing I would like to leave with the college women of my unseen audience the challenge of the task of saving civilization from the ravages of war —the challenge of reducing to reality the vision of internal and international peace and good will.

# Some Problems Relating to Curriculum Study Programs for the Improvement of Rural and Urban Conditions in the South*

By John R. McLure
*Director of Summer School, University of Alabama*

I shall discuss this subject under the following main headings: first, "Some Basic Factors Influencing the Organization and Promotion of Curriculum Programs"; second, "The Unique Place of the Southern Association Study in Our Curriculum Movement"; third, "Some Suggestions for the Improvement of Our Organization for Curriculum Work."

## I

Organized programs of curriculum study and revision have been under way in most of our Southern states for several years. The curriculum study movement, particularly as related to elementary and secondary education, has been the dominant factor in educational activity in our region. Teacher groups throughout the South are at work on various aspects of the curriculum. These groups are organized in various ways. Some of them are composed of teachers representing an individual school, while others are made up of the teachers of the local school system. In most of our states there are organizations representing the entire state school system. This work on the curriculum is at various stages of development.

These programs of curriculum study have created widespread interest and activity. Probably a larger proportion of teachers and school administrators are now participating in such programs than in any other type of cooperative in-service professional work that has been undertaken in recent years. A great many teachers will say privately at least that they do not know just where they are going or what it's all about. My impression, however, is that the overwhelming majority of them are not discouraged. They would not wish to see the enterprise discontinued. They are anxious to improve themselves and their work. They believe there is much room for improvement in their own schools and in school practices in general. I think we can say with confidence that the teachers in the public schools of the South tend to excel in the fine and coöperative spirit which they show in their work and in their professional relationships. No group of teachers anywhere in the United States could be more responsive to the leadership of those who hold the supervisory and administrative positions in public

* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 9, 1940.

education. One criticism of the way in which many state and local curriculum programs got under way is that they tended to come too much from the administrator and too little from the teachers themselves.

Curriculum study programs, of course, are not peculiar to the South. Some of the larger cities of the country and some of the county or other local rural school units were active before the movement struck us with full force. However, there is something distinctive about the curriculum movement in our section. It is this: curriculum work in the South has been promoted primarily as a statewide enterprise. In no other region, as a whole, have curriculum programs been organized and administered by a central state educational agency to the extent found in the South.

The leading role in curriculum work in the South has been played by the state department of education. The state department, with its combination of legal power and authority and with its professional leadership and prestige, has been in position to initiate and to blanket as it were over an entire state a far-flung program of curriculum activity. In some of our Southern states, these statewide curriculum programs did not come about as a result of the experiences or the suggestions of local school groups. Nor did they arise from the action of the state teachers' association or from representations by the teaching profession as a whole. Some of these programs came about largely from the decisions and activities of state school officials. It is this feature that characterizes the curriculum movement of the South.

There is some reason to believe that a more desirable procedure would have been to encourage for a time the curriculum work that had or would have sprung up here and there in local school systems, before a vast program was launched over an entire state. As it was, a good many teacher groups in local units were swept into such a program before they had the opportunity to do enough thinking and planning for themselves. They were not given sufficient time to attain a readiness for the best type of participation in such a longtime program. Undoubtedly many groups took up the work earlier than they would have, because they did not want it to appear that they were not coöperative or that they were not a part of the latest progressive movement in education. Without question, the action of local school systems was frequently influenced by officials or professors of an institution of higher education who were prepared to furnish consultative service. Doubtless, some of the administrative and supervisory officials did not want to run the possible risk of displeasing state department officials.

The important part played by powerful state departments of education is being emphasized in this discussion for a good reason. We cannot properly understand the development of curriculum work in the South without taking into consideration the fact that on the whole our state departments of education are unusually powerful and effective agencies in influencing what goes on in our public school systems. This situation is all the more

significant because of the further fact that the county unit system of rural school control characterizes public education in the South. In no other region in our country has the power and influence of the small school district been eliminated or minimized to such great extent as in the South.

The combination of a powerful state educational agency acting through the highly centralized county unit system is the most significant fact about school organization and administration in the South. In our situation it is possible to get a new educational movement under way with more ease and rapidity than can be done in regions in which public education is organized on a decentralized basis. In these matters some of our Southern states, relatively poor in income and wealth, can put into operation new educational theories and practices which many of the older and richer states could not undertake at all. Our highly centralized systems of state and local school control offer the opportunity of trying out what appears to be good without having to go through the longer and more tedious processes required in some other sections. Under wise and competent leadership this element in our educational setup may be used to great advantage. On the other hand it must be recognized that the potential dangers in such a situation are also very great. In such a situation officials bent upon educational reform or anxious for quick results with any new movement, may often proceed with their programs without bothering very much about democratic methods. I do not propose, however, to go further into that. I have been particularly interested in pointing out some of the important factors that gave momentum and spread to the movement for curriculum study and revision in our Southern region.

At any rate, our statewide curriculum study programs have resulted in a vast amount of good. Through these programs thousands of teachers have had a new kind of opportunity to continue their education and training. This has been done through purposeful work on their own school and classroom problems. Through such undertakings promising changes are being made in school practices all over the South.

## II

Probably the most significant approach that has been made to curriculum work in the South is that which has been made by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. I refer to the work that is going on in thirty-three high schools of the South under the general supervision of the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research.

The Southern Association Study, as is generally known, was organized to include three high schools in each of the eleven states represented in this Association. These schools were selected on the basis of their readiness and ability to put into practice the changes which the schools themselves would consider desirable or promising. Great freedom has been given to these

schools by the Association and by state agencies to depart if necessary from the existing standards for accreditment. Some have termed these schools the "unshackled" schools. The unique feature about the Southern Association Study is that at the very beginning the staff adopted what may be termed the experimental approach. Of even greater practical importance is the fact that the Southern Study staff has given a fine and clear-cut demonstration of the democratic method in curriculum work. The program stands in great contrast to the typical curriculum program promoted by some of our state school organizations.

The Southern Study staff undertakes to work with each one of these thirty-three schools as an independent group. It attempts to render such assistance as it can to each school group in the development of whatever plan or method of attack the school itself decides to make. Conferences including representatives of participating schools are held each summer. In these conferences each school continues to work upon its own problems, but opportunity is provided for counseling together on problems that are of common interest. The Southern Study staff has not resorted to speech-making or lectures in the promotion and conduct of their work. The staff has issued no curriculum bulletins. No educational creed was set up for the participating schools. Neither the staff nor any conference of the participating schools has produced a bulletin or a manual of any kind to guide teachers and school officials in their work. No printed literature has been circulated that would tend to set up a "standard" or a pattern of any kind.

Some may wish to criticize the Southern Association Study because it didn't do any of these things or because it didn't set out more clearly and definitely just what it was striving to do or what the participating schools should strive to do. These things could not have been done without endangering the experimental and democratic approaches which distinguish the work of the Southern Study. Already the Southern Study has made a major contribution to education in its "way of working" with teachers. The methods used by the Southern Study are the things which make it a matter of primary importance that the way be kept clear for the unhampered continuation of its work. There are other curriculum agencies at work in the South from which we can find out the results that may be obtained from the use of other methods.

It is no exaggeration, I believe, to say that the Southern Study is now entering upon some of the most difficult and hazardous phases of its work. The various experimental programs that are being tried out in participating schools have been under way just about long enough for some to feel that they can pass judgment upon what is being done. It is to be expected that some of these opinions will be unfavorable. Here and there some may feel that innovations should be opposed. There may be those who will feel it to be their duty to try to put a stop to such innovations. It would not be

surprising if some should like to bring the Southern Study to a close. One way to do this would be to surround the work with such restrictions that the essential character of the program would be destroyed. Whether or not these things flare up in dramatic fashion, they are bound to make themselves felt in some way or other.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, through the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, can do nothing more important from now on than to give solid support to the Southern Study staff and the thirty-three coöperating high schools. The controlling principle here is that which is everywhere recognized as appropriate and necessary for investigational or experimental work. The same attitude and policy should be maintained toward the work of the Southern Study staff that would apply to the work of a group of investigators in an institution of higher education where the principle of freedom of inquiry is defended. This involves so far as the Southern Study staff is concerned freedom to make some mistakes in the effort to help find a better way of conducting secondary education for our young people.

In such a program the Southern Study staff itself has duties and responsibilities imposed by such a principle. Inevitably there will be pressure from within and from without the staff for it to enter upon activities not directly and legitimately a part of the experimental program in the thirty-three high schools. Many inviting projects and suggestions will have to be rigorously resisted.

Time will be required before satisfactory evaluations can be made of the Southern Association Study. In the meantime, as I have already emphasized, let us see to it that its methods and its programs are permitted to operate without undue handicaps.

## III

Looking back over the whole field of curriculum development in the South, certain next steps seem to be indicated. All types of organizations for curriculum work need to take new major steps. The needed new steps would change the character of existing curriculum agencies. They would bring into existence entirely new agencies.

Up until this time curriculum programs state and local have for the most part been under the guidance of a curriculum consultant working through a steering committee or some other type of administrative agency. The consultant as a rule is either a professor of education or other person whose training and experience have been primarily in the field of the education and training of teachers or in school administration and supervision. Practically every state that has had a state curriculum program has had the benefit of the services of a curriculum consultant. Likewise in many cases the local school system has had a consultant. In some cases several consultants have worked together in the same program state or local.

The curriculum consultant has been a pioneer. He has furnished outstanding leadership. What has been done under his leadership should make it possible for us ultimately to adapt our educational practices and procedures more closely to the conditions and needs of our region. We shall continue to need the curriculum consultant. Someone with such training and experience is a desirable addition to any program relating to elementary and secondary school work. However, the curriculum consultant by himself is not adequate for the work, especially in its present stages. We must provide ways and means of supplementing his knowledge and his activities. We have now reached the stage where the services of other types of consultants and specialists are essential. There are at least two things that must be done.

In the first place, state and local school systems now need in addition to the curriculum consultant a number of specialists. Many of them will be found in institutions and agencies concerned with the education and training of teachers or with the administration and supervision of elementary and secondary education. Included in this group are such persons as the clinical psychologist, the mental hygienist, the psychiatrist, the specialist in reading, the specialist in guidance, including vocational guidance, the specialist in child growth and development, including those in nutrition and health, and play and recreation, and special teachers, such as those in music, art, and the vocational subjects. This kind of thing can be done without any great difficulty, especially in so far as such persons are available in educational institutions and agencies within the borders of our states. A number of curriculum consultants at institutions of higher education are already moving out into this phase of work.

The second step is much more difficult. It is that of associating with our curriculum work the professor of economics, the professor of sociology, the professor of political science, the professors in various scientific fields, and other students of so-called subject-matter areas in the social and natural sciences, in the arts, and in the vocations. We must associate with us students of conditions and problems relating to agriculture and rural life, industry and urban life, and commerce and business.

I have had the opportunity of discussing this more difficult step with various curriculum leaders. All of them seemed already to have reached the conclusion that the time has come for such a widening of the base for our curriculum work. One question only has been raised. It relates to what is often considered to be the difficulty of professors of academic subjects and professors of education going along together in such an undertaking. Some in professional education feel that there are few if any scholars in the so-called academic fields who are sufficiently informed about the public school curriculum. Especially is it claimed by some of them that it would be difficult to find such scholars who are in sympathy with the reconstruction of the

curriculum along certain lines currently advocated. The professor of education or the curriculum consultant who takes this point of view is convinced that his own ideas and proposals are progressive and worthwhile. He often feels that those who oppose his views wish only to perpetuate traditional or outworn practices. This attitude on the part of the educationist is, I think, wrong. It is unfortunate. It would be somewhat amazing if there should be complete, or even substantial agreement at the very beginning of any such coöperative undertaking. Why concern ourselves too much in advance about agreement? Correct processes and procedures in such vital matters of common concern are the important things to keep in mind. Anyway, who can say just what the results would be if we could establish a continuing coöperative attack on all fronts somewhat along the lines suggested?

If our curriculum consultants and other professionally trained leaders continue to develop their theories, their plans, and their proposals all by themselves, the result is likely to be disastrous. This is especially true where radically changed school practices are concerned. The gap will become wider and wider between them and other leaders and scholars who are interested in what is going on in our public schools. In time, these other scholars and leaders will have their say about these things. Ultimately they can and will exert a powerful influence upon public opinion regarding the educational program. After all, the curriculum does not belong entirely to the teaching profession. Ultimately the patrons of our schools and the people in general, who in the last analysis are in control, must be considered.

Regardless of the philosophy and attitude of professors of the academic subjects, they are scholars and leaders in their respective fields. They are in better position to find out the facts about many of the critical social and economic conditions in our states and in our Southern region than most of us. The point of view which has been emphasized again and again here is that we have come to the place in our curriculum work where we must seek the coöperation of other groups whose knowledge and services are essential to real and permanent progress. We must secure that coöperation and, I think, as promptly as possible.

In conclusion, we cannot fail to take into consideration the fact that the South has been designated as the nation's number one economic problem. Some of the evidence going to support that conclusion has been presented in a well-known report. All of us know that our region is rich in young people but poor in wealth and income. In this discussion it is assumed that the public school curriculum should as a matter of primary importance concern itself with conditions in the South. This does not mean that that part of our cultural heritage which should be common to the school experiences of all boys and girls should be minimized in our schools. On the other hand, a more complete appreciation and understanding of our own local and regional environment should enrich and make more meaningful all

other aspects of the public school program. If we are to improve living conditions in the South we must focus much of our school work on the social and economic conditions of our section.

Granted that this should be done, we are handicapped because we are not properly prepared to meet our obligations along these lines. We have some of the nation's outstanding scholars and research workers in the social and economic fields, but we do not yet have all of the facts that are needed for our schools and educational institutions. The facts that are known are not always organized and otherwise available as curriculum and teaching materials. This leads to one final suggestion.

We need a Southwide agency for the assembling and organizing of facts and for the production of materials for use in our schools. The participants in such a regional agency must be selected in such a manner that it will be clear to all that no undue political, social, and economic bias is represented. Likewise it is absolutely essential that no one agency or organization public or private be given a preponderance of representation in the agency. There is no organization in the South which is in better position to initiate a movement for such an agency than the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. We shall need other groups state and local working on problems of peculiar importance and significance to them. Such state and local groups would also function in the work of adapting materials for use in our schools.

In such an undertaking we must have the help of all persons and agencies whose business it is to try to know and understand the basic social and economic conditions and resources of our Southern region. No one type of organization, agency, or institution is sufficient to solve either the problems of agriculture and rural life, the problems of industry and urban life, or the problems of education.

Educational institutions of all types, not just one type of college or university, must have a vital part in the program. Organizations and agencies of all types, business, professional, and vocational, must work together on our problems. The problems of the South, whether of agriculture or industry, bear upon all of us. They belong to all of us. All of us must participate in the solution of these problems. Only by a frontal attack by all forces and agencies can we move forward. One of the biggest problems confronting schools and educational institutions of all types is that of learning how to coöperate effectively both within our own organizations and with all other agencies.

# Training Youth for Leadership in a Representative Democracy*

By J. G. Umstattd
*University of Texas*

Let it be clearly understood that leadership in a representative democracy is not limited to political leadership. In our American society there is need for as many kinds of leadership in addition to the political as there are kinds of social, economic, and occupational activities in our nation. It has been a serious mistake in the past to over-emphasize the political leader. It has caused us as a nation to let chance care for the leadership elsewhere. Our task is to elevate our non-political leadership—our leadership in industry, in commerce, in labor, in welfare, in education, in law, in medicine, in journalism, in the multitude of other occupations and enterprises in our American life. If we succeed in this task we shall advance more rapidly as a nation than would ever be possible with our present over-emphasis of the political. Furthermore, our emphasis must change from abstract consideration of the traits and works of leaders to constant practice of those traits. The older emphasis, built upon a decadent theory of learning, the memorized mottoes of which failed to influence the intended learner, must give way to an emphasis of vital experiences in leadership and in the democratic process which will root the traits into the very depths of the learner's mental processes. What I am saying is that our concept of leadership must be broadened to include all types of leadership, each to the degree to which it is needed in our society, and that our preparation of leaders must be through the experiential rather than the bookish route.

A second point which should be quite clear is the distinction between training for leadership and training of leaders. The problem under consideration is training *for* leadership. The phrase "for leadership" includes, in addition to the training for leading, the training to choose effective leaders and to aid the chosen leadership in carrying forward a constructive program in the activity involved. That is to say, in addition to leading effectively in certain activities there must be the willingness to be led in other activities. This willingness consists of being intelligently coöperative with the leader and constructively critical if the best results are to be obtained. It is conceivable that every person in a given activity under the leadership of the majority's choice for that activity is himself a leader in some other activity. The ability to help the duly selected leader in activities in which he is competent, and the ability to lead in one's own area of competence are twin

* An address delivered before the Commission on Secondary Schools, Atlanta, Georgia, April 9, 1940.

aspects of leadership in a democracy. There can be no external barriers in a democracy to prevent the person best qualified from rising to leadership in the activity of his competency; likewise there must be no internal barriers of conceit or arrogance to prevent that person from accepting the leadership of another in affairs in which he is not the best qualified. One must not be Mr. Hyde when he is in a group led by another and Dr. Jekyll only when he is a leader. Submission to and coöperation with capable leadership is as essential as the leadership itself in our democratic way of life. The power of the leader and hence his value for the common good resides less in his person than in the consent of the led. Strip any leader of the confidence and authority imposed in him by those whom he leads and watch his castle of power crumble to the earth. If there is truth in what I am saying, our efforts should be guided toward raising the level of all persons as potential leaders in their respective walks of life, and also toward raising their level as intelligent and coöperative workers with others chosen as leaders by the majority in other activities. Our problem is not to select a few and give them specific and concentrated preparation for ultimate leadership; rather, it is our twofold task to raise the level of all and to give to all the opportunity to lead in those activities in which they are qualified to serve as leaders, and to train each to help other leaders in other activities. This twofold process will result in greater appreciation of the problems of leadership, because all persons will be acquainted with those problems and through coöperative yet constructively critical participation all will help achieve a greater effectiveness of the leadership in serving the needs of a democratic society. This process is the surest safeguard against too great concentration of power in a Tory class as in England or in a single person as in Germany. Power in America must forever reside in the people, common as well as cultured, and the path to leadership must be kept clear of barriers of wealth, class, or prejudice, open for each to rise as high as his ambition, his talent, and his desire to serve will take him.

If we are agreed that we are discussing leadership for all types of activities and that the phrase "for leadership" includes the ability to give intelligent coöperation to leaders as well as the ability to lead, and I hope we are agreed upon these two points, we are ready to go forward to a consideration of ways and means that may lead to the goal we have defined and thus result in a higher level of leadership for every group activity in our society, and in a finer spirit of intelligent coöperation with properly qualified and regularly selected leaders everywhere.

Before we enter into our discussion of desirable improvements in our present methods of training leaders, may I say that I think a good case could be made for the proposition that American leadership in general since the turn of the century has been on the upgrade. It is not my purpose here to present the facts in this case, but I do wish to state my belief that our Amer-

ican way of life and our system of education in America are bearing fruit in better leadership and in better coöperation with leaders. This statement is made with full knowledge that many leaders are far from ideal and that some are rascals, pure and simple—but they are the exceptions that make the news. In saying that leadership is becoming more effective, I refer to all types of leadership—educational, industrial, commercial, social, political, and occupational leadership in general. To emphasize, if not to prove the point, I call your attention to yourselves who are leaders in education in your respective schools and colleges. While there may have been outstanding leaders in this Association in 1900 who overshadow any person here today, yet it is my conviction that your average far excels that of your predecessors in 1900 in your training for your job and in your effectiveness as leaders in that job. The same is true in every walk of life in America since the turn of the century. The progress being made in the quality of our leadership is the result of our American public and private schools and of our American way of life.

However optimistic one might be on this point, he will realize that numerous improvements must be made if we are to approach the ideal in quality of leadership for all our essential activities and if we are to approach the ideal in intelligent and critical coöperation with our leaders. The needed improvements are of two general types. They must not be limited to changes within our school system; they must also include changes in the forces outside the school which play a vital part in the training of youth for active participation in American life both as leaders and as intelligent followers. The two types of influence cannot be completely differentiated, because under the present concept of the educative process there is in the child's educative experience a constant interflow of school activities and community activities. But for purposes of analysis the two types of desirable change may be considered separately. Let us give our attention first to the out-of-school improvements which would strengthen our American program of training for leadership.

The first improvement to be considered is one which is fundamental if we are to improve the general average of our leadership, if we are to remove barriers to the rise of leadership, and if we are to prevent the all-too-frequent cross-currents of community conflict that frustrate well-coördinated community life. The improvement I have in mind is that every community should have a carefully formulated plan for its educational enterprises. Each community, whatever its type—city or rural, large or small—must coördinate its educational efforts into a well-knit plan for the best use of its educational agencies. By educational agencies I refer to every organized effort to affect the education of children and youth—all types of schools, all services of the public or private libraries, all recreational agencies both the commercial and the public, all social agencies that have education as

one of their objectives, all service organizations both for men and for women that aid in education, all educational facilities of religious groups, and all governmental agencies that have education as part of their aim.

The coördinated plan that I am suggesting will be well organized to prevent serious gaps in the training of youth, will avoid duplication of activities and expenditures, will eliminate many efforts that at present neutralize each other because of their conflicting purposes, and will generate tolerance and good will throughout the community. Such a plan will be in each community a demonstration to its youth of the democratic process in action, and as such will be a powerful influence upon their development even before they begin to profit specifically from its work. Furthermore, the plan will lend meaning to the educational activities directed toward leadership in democratic living, and will thereby stimulate the youth to enter the activities with sincerity and enthusiasm. Thus I call this step fundamental if we are to improve our plan for training for leadership. It strikes deeper than any program a school might devise. It provides the foundation upon which a rational plan within the school may be constructed.

The second point which I should like to stress is an aspect of the first. It is the better coördination of the so-called youth-serving agencies. In 1937, Chambers reported the purposes and practices of five-hundred such agencies in America.[1] In almost every community of any size these agencies are competing to attract youth to their programs, frequently with less thought of serving the youth than of promoting their own ends. This exploitation of youth should be curbed by educational and lay leaders through the development of a coördinated program which would discourage the undesirable agencies and enable each of the others to function in its proper sphere. One cardinal principle which should operate in this coöperative effort is that youth must not be over-stimulated. It is safe to say that over-stimulation of youth today is a factor in the increase of mental disorders. Here is a danger spot no longer to be ignored. If we are to have leaders of sanity tomorrow, our youth today must have experiences which aid rather than injure their mental health. A sound out-of-school program can be built for youth in any community through the well-coördinated efforts of agencies intended to serve youth. Care should be taken not only to avoid overstimulation of the superior youth but also to provide for all youth, according to their individual abilities and interests, the opportunity to participate in wholesome activities designed for their well-rounded and normal development. In this need lies a challenge for every American community, one which has been accepted and satisfactorily met in all too few cases. In bringing about this coördinated program, the school should coöperate with the other youth-serving agencies but it should not dominate them.

[1] M. M. Chambers, *Youth-Serving Organizations*, American Council on Education. Washington, D. C., 1937, 327 p.

A third acute need if we are to cope adequately with this problem of training for leadership, is the extension of such agencies as the Civilian Conservation Corps Camps and the National Youth Administration. Those who question this suggestion in a discussion of training for leadership may well be reminded of recent events in another land where unemployed youth were the nucleus around which a dictator built a power that today threatens the entire Western world. Opportunities for work must be provided youth to avoid their becoming prey to the wrong kind of leadership. But there is a more important reason for the extension of the CCC and NYA. It is constructive rather than preventive in aim. It is to conserve and develop the human resources in America and to give youth the chance to achieve their ambitions. According to Johnson and Harvey 306,490 students benefitted from the student aid program of the NYA in 1935-36, and 418,721 in 1936-37, while approximately 167,000 other youths were employed on work relief projects on the average each month during the same two years.[2] The grand total of different CCC enrollees had mounted to 2,365,335 by January, 1940.[3] No person can measure the harm these programs have prevented. These youth might have furnished an army of revolutionaries under an irrational though magnetic leader such as Hitler. Nor can any person measure the good the programs have done. Literally thousands of youth have returned to positions of minor or major leadership from their NYA and CCC experiences. There should be no question about the continuance of these programs so long as unemployment exists among our youth. The programs should be extended to include all unemployed youth who can profit from them. These sources in the future will provide thousands of leaders in lowly and lofty walks of life to lead the additional thousands of self-supporting and self-respecting citizens who will have received their chances in these same programs. Because of having had the opportunity to work and to become independent and self-respecting, this large mass of American citizenry will have reason to coöperate in the building of a finer national life, each leading in areas of his competency and assisting other leaders elsewhere.

A fourth pressing need of our program of training youth for leadership in this out-of-school category is increased encouragement and assistance to the Scouts and other organizations in their current attempts to reach the boy and girl not now reached by their programs. I am thinking of the neglected, underprivileged, and unwanted of low teen-age, the little brothers of Tom Joad, and of the Bigger Thomases of the Negro race. They are the forgotten children today who will be recalled in the crime headlines tomorrow as leaders of our underworld. Let the purifying rays of American idealism

[2] Palmer O. Johnson and Oswald L. Harvey, *The National Youth Administration*, p. 29 and 52, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1938, 121 p.
[3] Letter from S. M. Ransopher, Assistant Director, CCC Education, March 18, 1940.

penetrate the dark recesses of privation through the lenses of these patriotic, benevolent, and humanitarian organizations. Not all of the deprived are depraved. From their number in the past have come the Old Hickories and the Honest Abes. No claim is made that an increased emphasis upon giving a chance to the less-chance group will entirely solve this problem. But such an effort would open the door to thousands of potential leaders of socially desirable activities who without such guidance would probably become effective leaders of socially destructive activities. It should be added that dead-end kids are not restricted to large cities. Every hamlet has its share. This need is one that is not to be ignored in any fundamental program intended to train youth to carry on.

The four proposals I have made do not exhaust our list of out-of-school improvements. But much progress toward a higher leadership and a finer citizenship in America will have been made when each community has a carefully developed plan for all its educational agencies, when the youth-serving agencies in each community have been coördinated, when the CCC and NYA have been extended to include all unemployed youth who can profit from their programs, and when a nationwide effort has been focused upon the rural and city waif. The four illustrations serve to emphasize the fact that out-of-school improvements must parallel the improvements in our school programs if our goals in the training for leadership are to be attained.

Let us now turn our attention to the other half of the problem. What improvements within the secondary school should accompany those in the community outside the school? The four lines of improvement which I shall present for your consideration are in no sense startling innovations. No institution in a democracy should grow by extreme and irrational departures from its time-worn paths. On the other hand, no institution in a democracy should permit its traditional paths to become ruts. Where tradition rules too long, the ruts prevent the essential deviations needed to conform with new objectives. Worse yet, the walls of the ruts rise with age and gradually narrow the horizon to a thin ribbon of the sky, leaving the world unseen and the problems of humanity unattended.

The improvements which in my judgment should be made in our secondary schools avoid both extremes. They are neither ultra-liberal nor ultra-conservative. Perhaps they are in that unenviable mid-position which each extreme derides as being the other. Nevertheless, they are carefully designed to prevent that excessive propagation of function which leads to dissipation, and at the same time are intended to be equally effective as preventives of dry rot.

The first change which I propose, one which I trust is both sane and vital as a part of our program for training for leadership, is an increased emphasis upon pupil adjustment in our secondary schools. Realistic fiction, the stage, and the screen have dramatized the fruits of the depression in terms

of uprooted homes, deprivation and degradation, and all the host of mental demons of fear and hopelessness that prey upon a confused and frustrated people. Scarcely a home in America remains untouched by the repercussions of the thirties. And the forties were heralded by wholesale murder of human beings, innocent in their conviction that right is the basis of might and that peaceful democratic living is the best way of life.

Let us not be deceived into thinking that the adolescent mind has remained untouched by these economic, social, and political upheavals. Our schools are filled with children who have seen tragedy, who have known desperate hunger, children who feel insecure and who are afraid and therefore suspicious, whose parents have broken under the strain of unemployment and frustration. These children of the depression come to us with mal-nourished bodies, with blighted emotions, with retarded mentality, and with warped personalities. Among these dispossessed walk their more fortunate classmates, wondering what it is all about, sophisticated, skeptical of the future, many of them spoilt children of the well-to-do and seriously maladjusted to their social environment.

I do not wish to paint the picture darker than it is. There are many bright spots in it. But at the moment we are speaking of the mental, social, and personal maladjustments of the adolescents we face, and I am saying that it is of primary importance that we help the pupil overcome the maladjustments through processes definitely planned for that purpose as he proceeds through his secondary school experiences. This is not a problem that will solve itself while we complacently hold classes in this, that, or the other field of knowledge. It is a problem which requires penetrating intelligence and sound judgment. It calls for specialists trained in psychiatry, in social case work, and in the psychology of instruction. Above all, it calls for a philosophy of education which views subjects at the secondary-school level as instruments for the development of the child rather than disciplines for him to memorize for assumed future use. Everyone who has sensed keenly this problem of pupil adjustment knows that the secondary schools are failing miserably to solve it. The few schools that are doing it well, those in which clinical case-study and sound psychiatric practice are the order of the day, should become temples of worship for all persons elsewhere who call themselves teachers of youth.

The second improvement which I propose is that we continue to give increasing recognition to problems of present-day living. A good beginning has been made in providing for the secondary school pupil experiences which have meaning for him. The South has taken the lead in this problem with its state-wide curriculum revision programs from Virginia to Texas. The experimental work of this Association under the leadership of Hoke and Jenkins and their colleagues is paving the way to more vital experiences for programs that will help youth lay adequate foundation in realistic experi-

ence to meet with confidence and success the problems he will face as leader tomorrow. A new definition of scholarship is emerging, the essence of which is the ability to marshal and to command knowledge in the solution of the complex problems of everyday living. Such scholarship is the best foundation we can give our future leaders. Evidence comes from the colleges that youth who have learned to attack real problems while in high school excel in college their classmates from schools that follow the traditional pattern. Data released by Tyler of the University of Chicago in October, 1939, reveal that graduates of the six most experimental schools among the thirty included in his program of evaluation not only equal but actually excel in college academic performance the graduates of equal native intelligence from the comparison or control schools of the Eight-Year Study. These results are not surprising to those who understand that the experimental or modern programs of the most advanced secondary schools stimulate pupils to exert their best effort; that they permit and give recognition to creative thinking; that they sift the past for its best to solve problems of today, causing pupils to read with understanding more history and other records of the race than the traditional programs require; that they give mastery in the art of problem solving; that they imbue the adolescent with a scientific attitude, which because it has been built upon practical experiences carries over into similar practical experiences with life—in short the superior results from minds that have been liberated from the humdrum of imposed lesson-learning was expected by all who have studied the experimental programs in action and have not drawn their conclusions from ridiculous illustrations of disgruntled writers. Of some significance is the fact that the superior college academic achievements of the experimental group were accomplished in college curricula that resemble the traditional high school offering and were therefore new in pattern and method to the graduates from the experimental school. They were able to overcome this handicap and to equal or excel in academic performance the graduates of equal intelligence from the traditional schools.

A result of Tyler's evaluation that gives greater satisfaction than does the superior scholarship, to everyone vitally interested in training for leadership, is that the graduates of the six most experimental schools, as compared with graduates of equal intellectual and social status from the control schools, "participate more frequently in campus activities, show a greater interest in contemporary affairs, participate as freely in social life, have a broader range of interest in aesthetic experiences, both creative and appreciative," and have a better mastery of study skills.[4]

The secondary-school pupils throughout America and our society tomorrow will be vastly benefited by the curriculum programs of the South, by

[4] Ralph Tyler, *General Report on the College Performance of Graduates of the Thirty Schools and the Comparison Schools.* (Mimeographed) University of Chicago.

the studies under Hoke and Jenkins, by the schools which Tyler has evaluated, and by similar secondary school programs elsewhere. These new programs are not alike in detail; but they are alike in such fundamentals as the emphasis upon current problems of youth and of society, the philosophy of education that seeks to enlighten and liberate rather than to indoctrinate and dominate, and instructional practices that stimulate the pupil to his best effort, that emphasize the ability to seek and solve problems, that set the pupil free to work and study, that afford him numerous opportunities to lead and to demonstrate his ability, and that apply the best of the world's knowledge to situations of real meaning to the adolescent.

My second proposal is that we should continue in our march toward this kind of secondary education. It makes for a higher quality of scholarship, and what is more important it is already resulting in a finer and more experienced leadership.

The third point related to the secondary school which I wish to stress is a tendency that is already marked in various parts of the country. It is the drift from the Carnegie unit as a measure of high school experience and as a standard for college entrance. This development is the natural reaction in a democracy against a pattern of secondary-school work that has failed to change with the society which it serves. The development is wholly in accord with our desire to improve our program of training for leadership.

In 1905 and 1906 when Pritchett defined the unit and proposed that a high school course should consist of fifteen units, college teachers were little if any better prepared than high school teachers are now, neither the high school principalship nor the superintendency had developed as a profession, Binet had not published his scale, child study as a science had not begun, educational diagnosis was two decades away, the science of education had not been born, curricular deviations and enrichments to fit individual differences were unknown, all pupils took the same work with docility and without reference to need or else were either punished or forced out of school, the work taken was limited in the main to the sixteen subjects and the rigidly prescribed program set by the Committee of Ten, fewer than fifteen per cent of the youth of high school age were in high school, and the chief if not the sole aim of the high school was to prepare for college.

An analysis of the developments that have occurred in the secondary school since 1905 is not possible on this occasion, nor is it necessary, because every person present knows a great transition has taken place in each aspect of the problem just mentioned. A number of the developments are of direct bearing upon the use of the Carnegie unit as a measure of achievement and of requirements for college entrance. The high school principals as a group are now better qualified to know what adolescents need than are college entrance committees, their organizations in some parts of the United States being the most professional groups in education; present-day mental meas-

urements are far more valid as estimates of intellectual power than were the formal subjects of the earlier day; scientific studies of adolescents have revealed need for experiences not measurable in terms of blocks of time spent in classrooms and have shown that the traditional treatments often impair the emotional stability of the adolescent; techniques of diagnosis have made mockery of the practice of equal drill for all; every teacher worthy of the name permits wide and varying ranges of interests and work within any field studied, so that no two children complete their experience in the class with the same interests and achievement; and the influx of all the children of all the people has led to a diversity of function no longer to be fulfilled by sixteen tightly corked and neatly wrapped bottles of racial heritage however blessed they may be by powers that formerly reigned. The secondary school is the people's college of America, and its program must be one that will draw upon the total reservoir of racial knowledge, irrespective of its man-made departmental barriers, in order to help the people solve their problems.

At present the Carnegie unit is the jam log in the stream of educational progress. Children entering the elementary school find a stimulating environment and enjoy a fascinating search for knowledge. Their young minds are liberated further in the junior high school with its broad and flexible presentation of what man has done and is doing. They have been close to life and have felt it throb. They have learned to live and to lead in a thousand worthwhile activities that stimulate them to zealous endeavor. In far too many cases they then enter senior high school and study from books ideas that were facts a decade before, in order to accumulate orthodox Carnegie units for college entrance.

There is no need for pushing this point further. Studies by Douglass and others in Oregon and Minnesota have shown the futility and unreliability of any set pattern of subjects as college entrance requirements; every high school principal knows that the pattern set for the twenty who go to college forces upon the eighty who think that someday they may go, but few of whom ever will, a program wholly unsuited to their needs and abilities; studies by Learned and Wood have shown the amazing diversity of achievement among pupils holding the same number of units; the *Regents' Survey* is a scathing indictment of the bottled-up kind of education followed by a pernicious examination system, so far as the achievement of social competence and leadership is concerned; Koos in his *Summary* of the National Survey of Secondary Education shows the Carnegie unit to be the "chief obstructive influence" in the articulation of junior and senior high school (page 167); and superior teachers everywhere are abandoning the Carnegie-unit organization of racial experience and in its place are substituting real and vital learning experiences in which scholarship is not restricted to separate areas and in which free minds are permitted to seek the knowledge that will help

them satisfy their needs as present and future citizens and to pursue their diversified interests.

As my third proposal for the program of development for leadership, therefore, I advocate the gradual abandonment of the Carnegie unit and the gradual development in its place of a series of learning experiences broader and more searching and severe in their demands upon man's wealth of knowledge, better adapted to the nature, needs and capacities of adolescents, and more effective in their preparation for living in and helping improve our twentieth century society. At the college vestibule this change will call for an adequate guidance program to consider each student recommended by his high school principal or by his high school committee as an individual case and to help him select the college program best fitted to his abilities and purposes, conditioned in proper degree by the needs of our society.

The fourth and last suggestion I shall make is another which has made progress in recent years, particularly since democracy as a way of life has been challenged by dictators. It is that the nature and organization of the curriculum and the spirit of instruction be such that the pupil may have continuously through his elementary and secondary school work a wealth of experience in the democratic process. This development provides the spirit under which the other three I have suggested find expression. Normal pupil adjustment thrives best and maladjustment is most effectively prevented when the individuality of the pupil is respected, when the pupil is given opportunity to grow and to develop at the pace nature has set for him and in the directions of his dominant interests, and when he coöperates with others in planning and pursuing experiences for the general welfare of the group and for the well-integrated development of himself. These democratic practices are vital to the prospective leader of democratic tomorrow. The democratic process is both a means and a standard for selecting and solving the problems of present-day living that should increasingly give meaning and vitality to the secondary-school curriculum. And in making the transition from the Carnegie unit to a more rational organization of school experience the soundest procedure is the slow and deliberate democratic process in which each move will be proved through group discussion of community, staff, and students, and through subsequent experimentation.

There can be no better preparation for leadership in a democracy tomorrow than through constant participation in the democratic process today. There can be no surer preventive of totalitarianism in the next generation than through living in the democratic way in the schools in this generation.

The democratic ideal should likewise pervade the community developments outside the school which I have discussed earlier in this paper. It should govern the development of the broad educational plan of the community, should be fundamental in the philosophy of the youth-serving

agencies as their programs become more thoroughly coördinated, should continue to be the moving force of the NYA and the CCC as their opportunities are offered to increasing numbers of forgotten youth, and should be the theme of the proposed extension of aid to the early teen-age children of the depression.

Thus constant experience in, and under the influence of, the democratic process becomes the prime factor in the training of youth for leadership in a representative democracy. The democratic ideal should be the guiding genius of those improvements in community and school which will make for more effective selection of, and coöperation with leaders, and which will assure us of more talented leadership in all walks of life in our ever-advancing democratic society.

# The Benham, Kentucky, High School at Work: Part I*

By John A. Dotson
*Superintendent, Benham High School, Benham, Kentucky*

If you should visit the Benham High School before eight o'clock, you would find in the office a group of happy teachers talking over their social experiences, checking mail, or just enjoying each other. At eight o'clock you would find them gathering around tables in some work-room to talk over their concerns about students or student groups, and planning for the day's work. At these meetings often will be students who have come to help plan or advise with the staff. They are as welcome as any staff member and in most cases feel equality in all group discussions. In the corridors many are gathered around the students' store, for the majority come long before 8:30, the hour for beginning the day's work. No teacher will be in the corridors with them. Soon they begin to go to their home-rooms or work-rooms and start their work. At eight-thirty all assemble in their counseling rooms where they gather around tables of their own choice, or go to the vertical file where they get their folders to make a diary of their progress of the previous period or to make a work sheet for this day or for a longer time.

If you should enter one of these rooms you would probably have to search for the teacher or perhaps conclude he wasn't there. The good order maintained would likely convince you that you could locate him if you asked some student. You might be surprised to find that he wasn't there, for possibly he would be in some other work-room counseling with another teacher or group.

If you should come after eight o'clock and go to the principal's office, you would not find him there trying to keep all the records or attempting to know where all the students are or what they are doing, or signing absence excuses, or making statistical studies, or handling discipline cases. He likely would not even be there. Rather, you would find a small group of students running the office, doing clerical work, or working on problems of their own. One of these students would offer to find the principal, or suggest the hospitality group who would receive you and take you where you wished to go, or tell you what you could see if you had no definite program in mind.

The hospitality group would show you the "home living center," where you would find individuals and groups whose chief interests are centered

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

around the arts of making a home, living in a community, entertaining friends, building a personality. Both boys and girls are solving problems of common concern and interest, problems which they themselves recognize and need help with.

In the reading room you will see individuals seeking materials which they did not have in the work-rooms, or reading newspapers, magazines, or books, sometimes for pleasure, other times for desired information. The librarian will not be issuing books or repairing books, or cataloguing. This the students do, with help as needed. Rather, the librarian will be seated at a table with one or more students, assisting in reading problems, source materials, working on written or oral expression, or discovering needs for library orders. In another room of the library you may find a committee of students working on the problem of how best to spend a limited library and supplies budget.

In the business area you will find students working on a real problem, as keeping accounts for the store, or balancing the day's business of the credit union or cub bank, or keeping the accounts for the school fund which is used to buy books, art, shop, and other materials. You will also find students typing letters or reports, or taking dictation.

In another room is a group of individuals, preparing a movie scenario, reading plays, writing a play, giving or listening to reports of common interest, making graphs, drawing a plan for a magazine rack for use in that room, or for the cub bank not yet built, or discussing the local or world situation as found in the news, or publishing the daily paper, or working on skills in the English area as the need for these skills has developed in their work.

At one end of the building is a unit of two large rooms and one small room devoted to problems concerning skills and practice in mathematics and science. Here is a boy preparing for West Point who in seven months has made more progress in algebra than any other student has ever done. Others have found the need for drill on fractions since they cannot successfully handle chemical solutions without this skill. A group of boys are repairing small household motors. Another group is building a biology pond and is heating sand to get correct weight for the concrete mixture. Still others are studying frog eggs under microscopes, or making a form for a community survey of garbage disposal. In the yard, setting native mountain laurel, or evergreens, or rambler roses about the ventilation shaft for beauty and fragrance, is another group.

In the art room are others working on a mural, picturing the history of Benham from the days of the Indians to the present industrial period. Another student is doing a portrait, or has gone to the hills for a landscape. Still others are making cardboard houses, or decorating them, or working on dress designing.

In the gymnasium you may find the band, or a group playing games or folk dancing, or practicing plays with a student director, or working with puppets.

In the nurse's rooms students will be working on problems of girl-boy relations (one girl confides that she has never had a date, though sixteen), or personal posture, with silhouettes, or photographs, practicing graceful walking, or studying diet to gain or lose weight or preparing to be a nurse, giving first aid and treatment for minor injuries and needs.

In the shop may be seen boys and girls making games or furniture, upholstering old pieces, building additional equipment for the school, or making gadgets for use in handicraft in the art area.

In other rooms you may find students practicing on the piano or other musical instruments, or working in groups or as soloists, or directing music in the elementary school, or conducting a rhythm band for the beginners, or teaching piano, or working with elementary teachers to aid students to learn various fundamental skills.

If you should go out into the community you would find some boys and girls working two or three hours a day in a store, or shop, or office, coördinated as much as possible with the aid of teacher-employee conferences, or others studying the filtration plant, or visiting the market, or hospital, or other places where aid may be found in the solution of their problems.

If you should return to the school that evening, you could see a group of about fifteen parents and as many of their children with their teachers, seated around tables with no program planned, talking about some problems. Sometimes it may be a free discussion of what the children did that day, or how the parent can help in the student's problems, or trying to discern student and community needs.

In the reading room may be a meeting of the Harvester Club, a club for Benham men, organized and maintained by themselves, or elsewhere, a troop of scouts, or a church party, or a community dance, or the community orchestra practicing, or a band parents party.

But why tell this story?

It is our belief that all thinking educators agree on certain fundamental concepts of what a school should attempt to do for its students and community. These concepts may be expressed in certain phrases such as that the student should become increasingly more able to think critically, to be self-reliant, to accept responsibility, to acquire and use certain skills, to do creative thinking and contribute to the world's progress, to develop and use good work habits, to be able to make a speech and defend his views, to speak and write clearly and fluently, to have purpose in his life, to acquire and develop qualities required by the colleges and business world. We believe also that few thinking educators will deny the statement that high schools

to a great extent are failing to do anything about these accepted fundamental concepts.

We had a student who had a straight "A" record, member of the Benham chapter of the National Honor Society, who applied for a Harvard national scholarship. The committee sent a folder to complete. One question very significant to us was what had he ever done himself without teacher direction, such as publish a little community paper, write for a paper or magazine, build a radio, rebuild an old car, set up a science shop in his basement, or what not. For three hours I questioned him, but found only that he had always done very well what he had been told but had never carried his skills into creative or independent fields.

During the last two years that the Southern Association published comparative tables of the success of freshmen of various high schools in college, our graduates who attended college showed fewer failures than any other school in our section except one. Their comparative success in college did not disturb us, as did the fact that many only attended college a few semesters and comparatively few ever graduated. The cause in some cases was lack of funds, but in most cases lack of purpose. One of our graduates, who is now a senior in one of the best universities in the South, first planned for industrial chemistry. His sophomore year he decided to try law. I understand some of his best friends were taking courses leading to law. In his senior year he decided to prepare to enter the field of industrial relations. That boy's father and I, at his father's request, made out his entire high school schedule, while he was in the eighth grade, in terms of subjects to be taken each year. He had the so-called difficult courses, mathematics, science, and languages. He had no vision of experiences to be had outside of these fields and no guidance from his teachers toward that. Had he tried his chemistry in a different way, or had he thumbed through musty old volumes when in the library testing his pleasure at briefing articles or reading legal documents, or had he had real experiences as in studying company-employee relationships and reading news of what was then happening in the world, he might have entered college with a definite purpose.

Many similar cases in college and business led our staff and some of our community to try to think through our way of teaching. We realized that our set-up was not doing all that it should. We were in a sense drawing a hop-scotch for each student and directing him to hop into certain squares and attempting to give guidance toward the end of our job with him from accumulated records. We wondered how it would be to rub out the lines in the squares and try to help a student find himself day by day. If this could be done, guidance would become a continuous process. We realized the difficulty of this, and that extreme care must be taken to see that the student was progressing continually while working at the things which seemed important to him and to his teachers. It was evident to us in the

early stages of our planning that we could not find how to do this by studying what others had done and forming a new or modified plan, by selecting what in our judgment was good from various plans. Our program then was to begin with the child rather than a plan of action.

We do not think that our plan is a finished product or that it ever will be. We wish to be able to continue to work on it. The students and teachers, the parents and community, wish to thank the Southern Association for making it possible for the school to try to do something about the problems of secondary education, and to express the hope that the opportunity will be continued.

To give you a clearer picture of the Benham school at work some of the teachers will tell you what several individual students are doing.

## The Benham, Kentucky, High School at Work: Part II*

By Joseph L. McCauley
*Mathematics Teacher, Benham High School, Benham, Kentucky*

During the past summer at Chapel Hill when we were discussing the possibility of attempting to set up a program whereby we would actually attempt to work with boys and girls, one thing that constantly bothered us was this question: what would the daily program of a boy or girl look like if he or she were to plan his or her own work? To this we found no answer. Since we have had the privilege during this year of trying to help each student to build his own program, this question has been answered. At least we know that with careful counseling students can and will devise what seem to be good plans of work.

Thinking that the same question might have caused you some wonder, I have chosen to take two of my students through a typical day and attempt to give you a picture of what you might expect to find in our school.

The first pupil whom I shall use is one that has always been better than average; she might be called a good student. The second one that I have selected has failed to pass one-third of his high-school courses. These two pupils have been selected because they represent two types of individuals.

Let us now see what Evelyn did through Thursday of last week. She came to my room at eight-thirty. Since there was no business which concerned the entire group that day, Evelyn outlined her work as quickly as possible, for she needed to go to the school store to check stock so that the daily sup-

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

plies could be purchased. At nine-twenty Evelyn returned to my room where she was studying about the development of the human embryo. Here she worked individually on this problem. Once during this time I was called to her table to give her help. She became interested in this question as a result of the work she is doing on her problem of child-care which she is working on under the direction of our home economics teacher, Miss Chick. Evelyn finds this work very interesting, for she believes that information of this type will help her to be a more intelligent housewife. At eleven-twenty Evelyn attended a program of worship which had been planned by the student council on religious training. Had Evelyn not attended this program, we would have seen her meeting with a small group of students who were with the commercial teacher for the purpose of securing help in shorthand. Evelyn enjoys her secretarial work, since she feels that a girl planning to marry should be in a position to support herself if it should ever become necessary. In the afternoon Evelyn went to the typing room where she typed her outline of work on child-care. This required about one hour. On some days she spends an hour on practice exercises trying to improve her present efficiency. Following this hour in the typing room, Evelyn went into an adjoining room where she spent the remainder of the afternoon helping to keep books on the school funds. This work she does under the supervision of the commercial teacher. When Evelyn is not assisting with this bookkeeping problem, she either does secretarial work for the commercial teacher or does some exercises in a bookkeeping manual which she uses at times because she feels that by doing a little practice of this nature she increases her skill in this work. Evelyn may be found many afternoons working after school.

Let us now leave Evelyn and look at the daily program of another student, Hoyt, a big boy who is a football and basketball player, besides being a good track man. Hoyt is a junior who has remained in school for the sole purpose of participating in athletics; as a result, his scholastic standing is very poor, and at times he has been unable to take part in athletic contests because of his failure to remain eligible. At the beginning of this school year, Hoyt upon finding that he might plan with his counselor his own program of work decided immediately that he wanted to make a study of the present European war. Besides reading all the daily news available and listening to the radio, he began to find out something about the issues responsible for the war. During this time Hoyt would come to me at eight-thirty, make his daily plans in about ten minutes, and begin his work on the war. For three hours he would read daily papers, weekly magazines, and browse through history books. At eleven-thirty he would go home for lunch and then report to shop at twelve-thirty where he was making plans with another boy to build a boat. After working on his boat plans, along with assisting in getting the shop straightened up and tearing down a local building for

lumber, he found that he would not be able to secure the needed lumber for his boat; as a result, all his interest in shop was lost. After two months of working this way, Hoyt decided to change his program. He was now thoroughly convinced that the "new plan" was not doing for him what it should; as a result, Hoyt and I went into conference. In this individual conference he expressed a desire to return to what he called the "old plan"; so the conference ended with Hoyt having a plan of work whereby he would study United States history, grammar, physics, and continue part-time in shop. This program moved along rather smoothly for three weeks, when Hoyt decided that maybe the "old system" was not so good after all. Immediately following the Christmas vacation, Hoyt in an individual conference expressed a desire to improve his speech and writing. Together we decided that this help could best be secured through Miss Ramsey, who has special training for doing work of this type. In the following morning faculty meeting I arranged for Miss Ramsey to see Hoyt at one o'clock. In this meeting Miss Ramsey discovered that Hoyt had a hidden desire to write for the local paper.

Keeping in mind that this last conference with Hoyt was held in January, let us now take a look at him and see what he, too, did one day last week. At eight-thirty he came to my room, where he planned his work. At nine o'clock, around a table in my room he met with the Benham Hi Annual staff and made plans for securing more money and discussed certain features of the annual. This group meeting lasted until ten o'clock, when Hoyt went to Miss Ramsey to complete his news item for the local paper. As he began his work, the editor of the school daily interrupted and asked him to write a report on the previous day's intramural sports program. Since the school daily had to come out by noon, Hoyt stopped his other writing and immediately went to the student intramural manager for the results of the games he was to report. At eleven-twenty Hoyt was too busy to attend the worship service which was planned by the council on religious training. In the afternoon Hoyt returned to Miss Ramsey's room where he completed the news for the weekly paper. At three o'clock he reported to my room to show me what he had accomplished. Needless to say that he is very proud of this work which he is doing, and as a result he clips his writings as they appear in the papers and keeps them in a scrap book. As you will have no doubt noticed from the picture which I have tried to give you of Hoyt, he is one that had been a perfect misfit in school so far as his studies were concerned. Today we find him participating in various activities with renewed confidence and interest. Yesterday I asked him to tell me what he considered to be the most outstanding accomplishment of his entire high school career, other than his athletics. After a short time he made this reply: "I believe my writing for the papers has done me the most good; but you know when

I stop to think of it, I have not done very much that is worthwhile during my four years in high school."

To me one outstanding factor about the whole program is the fact that the person who attempts to loaf under such a plan of work becomes very conspicuous, and as a result is very uncomfortable. Being held responsible for his own planning, he is unable to lay the cause of his idleness to any of his teachers. It has been my observation that this situation usually results in driving even the laziest pupil to developing some plan of work.

## The Benham, Kentucky, High School at Work: Part III*

By Jennie Ramsey
*English and Social Studies Teacher, Benham High School, Benham, Kentucky*

Should you enter the senior home-room during the first part of the school day, you would find forty or forty-five students seated at tables busily engaged with problems which concern this group. Likely the president is leading the discussion. Upon finishing whatever discussion there might be the students immediately begin to write their diaries for the preceding day and make definite plans for the present day. The sponsor during this time goes from table to table or person to person to check planning sheets and help students formulate plans or make decisions when necessary. A student who is able to plan well will accomplish much more than the one who does whatever happens to present itself first. This type of work lasts from forty-five minutes to an hour and a half, depending upon the length of the discussion. As the individuals finish their plans, they are then ready to proceed with the day's work without waiting for a bell or signal. The majority of these people remain in this room for another hour or hour and a half, during which they may be pursuing an individual problem or working in a group. This is done by reading, writing, oral reports, round-table discussions, and various types of quizzes. During the day students from various classes work in this room in a similar way. Both group and individual conferences with the teacher may be observed at intervals during the day.

Possibly you would like to follow some of these students through a typical day's work. At the beginning of the school year after much discussion individual and group problems were planned. Suppose we go with a boy who plans to enter college next fall and to prepare to be a director of physi-

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

cal education. When this particular boy was in junior high, he disliked school very much; but the physical education teacher succeeded in securing his interest in intramural sports, and gradually gave him certain little responsibilities as he would accept them, until within a year or two he was doing quite a bit of work in this one field. He says that this experience gave him the idea of wanting to be a physical education director. He now spends a part of nearly every day working with groups of sixth, seventh, or eighth grade boys in the gymnasium. He plans their activities with them, and he says that they always have time for showers.

A part of each day he spends in mathematics, algebra and geometry being pursued. As a freshman he failed algebra because he saw no need for it. He says now that it isn't practical, but he is taking it to meet college entrance requirements and is doing satisfactory work. He is taking geometry for the same purpose and felt the same way about it until the second semester, when he began what he calls "practical" geometry. He works on this in connection with his shop work. He says it becomes real when you draw plans for your projects and really construct something. Along with this, he keeps a record of all shop expense for the entire year, estimates value of finished projects; and with the advice of the shop teacher, he plans to estimate the cost of school repairs that are made by the shop boys. Part of his time he spends on individual projects. At present he is rebuilding a high chair for his niece. Other work that he has done includes the upholstering of a chair, helping build the school store, doing repair work at school, and finishing a desk.

He says that he has a definite need for oral expression and written reports because they have always been difficult for him; and though he isn't perfect, he has improved rapidly in these fields. Many of his written reports concern physical education or current events. He likes *News Week* best for current events. One book that he definitely recommends to high school students is *Your Tell Tale English.* At present he is working with a scenario group which is picturing the trends of Benham High School during the past few years.

As a freshman he asked if he might study color combinations in the field of clothing. This desire was not realized until this year. He and five other seniors have worked on such problems as the selection, color, care, and repairing of clothing, the selection of a day's diet, and a study of social relationship. During the latter problem he suggested that the boys select a group of girls to join them in discussion of boy-girl relationship. This resulted in a frank presentation of their social problems. At present, they are working on family finance. Already the group has expressed a desire to study money management in college.

Last summer this student spent six weeks in a C. M. T. C. camp; he plans to return this year; and says that he will continue the work as an R. O. T. C.

member in college. He thinks the training in marching is related to his work in physical education.

During the year he has been very active in other fields of work. He was on the varsity football and basketball squads. This required hours of work. He coached a girl's basketball team for a short period of time, has worked with high school recreation, led several student-body discussions on recreation, kept individual and class records for intramurals, officiated in games, and the like. He feels that his most valuable experience this year has come from working with his groups in the gymnasium, because he has learned much about dealing with people. In junior high he and his teachers often did not understand each other, but he says he now understands a teacher's position much better. He has done an excellent piece of work with these groups.

Now let us follow the program of a boy who does not plan to enter college. His main interests lie in the field of mechanical or commercial work. He has always enjoyed "tinkering" with radios and cars. About two hours of each day are spent at the shop where he works on shop motors and cars whenever these are available. Our shop as yet does not have an automobile department. One phase of his shop activity is in the field of wood-work. During the fall he helped build a house, he has built tables and small projects of his own, and has done some papering. Along with some other boys he tore down and helped repair an old radio that belonged to the school. A part of each day is spent in studying geometry. He gives two purposes; he feels that it is related in the mechanical area, and he says he might change his mind about going to college. He says that he might some day have a small shop of his own, and if he did it would be necessary for him to be able to keep records or accounts of his assets and liabilities; so he is acquainting himself with bookkeeping. He is secretary and treasurer of the Benham Cub Bank; therefore he must keep accurate personal accounts. He also makes a monthly financial statement which is posted in various rooms for the depositors' inspection.

About an hour each day he spends in acquiring typing skill. A portion of his day is used in reading, writing, and making reports on subjects related to his problem. Correct spelling and oral expression are two of his weaknesses, and he works daily on each. Two magazines that he reads regularly are *Popular Mechanics* and *Popular Science*. He has written a number of letters for materials and has spent much time reading Audil's *Engineers and Mechanics Guide*, Vol. I and Vol. VIII. He says his responsibility of keeping accurate records in the bank has meant more to him than anything else: "I may not be up with some in my bookkeeping workbook, but I believe I can keep books in an acceptable manner." For his own pleasure he spent several hours after school practicing for varsity football and basketball.

These are brief surveys of two students' work. Neither of them has a perfect record, but each has made definite improvements during the year.

New areas in which students may work this year are mechanical drawing, solid geometry, trigonometry, and art. This is also the first time that physics and chemistry might be pursued during the same year.

Many students' programs would prove as interesting as these, but I cannot discuss them now; possibly some phases of their work may be brought out in the discussion which will follow this panel. In all my teaching experience I believe I can truthfully say that I have fewer loafers in my group this year than ever before.

## The Benham, Kentucky, High School at Work: Part IV*

By Juliet Chick
*Home Economics Teacher, Benham High School, Benham, Kentucky*

Unlike the problems of Miss Ramsey's seniors, most of which are vocational, the problems of the thirty-five sophomore girls for whom I am counselor are selected for the most part on the basis of immediate needs. These problems are varied, but back of the majority of them one can recognize the desire to be better homemakers and to bring about better home living in Benham.

Problems selected are similar to those regularly selected in the area of home economics: problems related to meal planning, nutrition, child care, house planning, money management, sewing, home nursing, personal grooming, family and social relationship. The main difference lies in the fact that all students are not working on the same things at the same time, the time element is flexible, and various phases of the same problem are serviced by different departments in school. To be specific, there may be as many as eight groups working on different things at the same time, some groups larger than others, and some individuals working on their own problems. Long-time planning enables each group to go ahead with work without the assistance of the teacher each day. Examples of the type of problems chosen might include various food problems, such as a plan for increasing weight among undernourished children and the problem of more adequate meals and lunch baskets for fathers who work in the mines and have a minimum of sunshine. Students are also in charge of various school projects; such as, school lunch, which is planned, cooked, and served by students, and the

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

school mid-morning lunch of milk and graham crackers served to children in the first six grades. Banquets have become school projects and afford worthwhile experiences for planning and serving large quantities of food.

Then there is the "home living center." A large group of high school students have organized themselves, made definite plans, and have begun work on remodeling an old building into a home to be used as "home living center" for the school and community. Boys and girls are working cooperatively on this project. It is to represent their planning and will be furnished in keeping with community standards. Several students working on child care problems have the added experience of assisting in the first grade. In addition to regular sewing problems one group of girls has designed and constructed costumes for the operetta and school plays. This year for the first time boys have had the privilege of working on problems in the area of home economics, and this group has very definitely stated its problems and gone to work on them.

Too many problems have been dealt with to discuss them all. Perhaps it would be better to think of a typical day with one of my girls. On the first day of school this student handed me a card which she had made out the previous year and which had on it: home economics, French, English, and mathematics. After several group conferences and one individual conference she confided in me to the extent of letting me know that she did not feel free to enter into group discussions. With this in mind she joined a group of girls working on various problems which we had grouped together under the general term of the "hospitality group." She decided to go to Mr. Taylor, an English-social-studies teacher, because she "liked" history and wished to improve her oral and written expression. She also entered a dramatic group actually to take part in oral work. She took French out of natural curiosity concerning the subject.

She says it was her work in the hospitality group which gave her her very first chance to take responsibility and depend on herself, for it was in this group that she saw a need for changing the home economics room and did something about it. Two large laboratory desks were taken up. A kitchen unit was placed in one corner of the room. Six breakfast room tables and chairs were bought unfinished and were finished by this group at the shop to provide better for informal small-group discussions. This group worked out a plan by which the community might use the home economics room without interfering with group standards. It was this group also that suggested a hospitality committee for the entire school, and this student became one of the members of this committee. She said that she learned to be critical of her work through the planning, preparing, and evaluating of simple meals by the group. She first began taking part in discussion when the group decided to have a "question box" to discuss problems with which they were faced. The group looked forward to these discussions. Here many of them

learned not to make a statement without being able to back it up or give a reason "why" for their opinions.

In the dramatics group, besides reading plays and studying the fundamentals of acting, this student helped direct a play. She has also entered several essay contests. She became interested in oral reading and as a result entered a speech contest and now readily assumes this responsibility when called upon. She spent some time on the writing of poetry and at the present is attempting to write a play. She says French this year has been mostly drill work, but that next year she wants to outline it for herself, making much of it oral work and learning economic conditions and food and clothing habits among present-day French people.

Due to an extremely bad habit of biting her fingernails she chose the problem of personal grooming, which she has approached both in my area and the science area. Due to conflict over a personal allowance she spent some time on money management and learning to budget so that she could spend more wisely. In connection with this she wished to learn to sew in order to save money and to help her mother with clothing repairs by taking the place of an older sister who has gone to college.

Other interests in which she has had a part have elected her secretary of the entire "home living center" group, being chosen member of the "Tiger Club," and cooking and serving at banquets. She has also assumed leadership in several student conferences. One would not recognize her as the student who said to me at the beginning of the year, "I simply can't say a word in a group of students."

As a contrast, let us look at a student who knew exactly what she wanted to do at the first of school and who has stuck exactly to her original broad problem, branching out now and then into smaller problems which were in some way connected with this. She said, "I want to be a nurse, and I want to work on things which will help me to be one." She outlined a problem of home nursing and social relationship, or "getting along with other people." She went to the science area to develop laboratory techniques needed in nursing and for textile testing, since she had made up her mind to learn to design and construct her own clothes in order to save money later on in college. In a recent conference she said to me, "Always in choosing a problem I think whether I can put it into practice or not; and I always want to find out what a problem is about so I can tell just how practical it will be."

She entered music, glee club, and choir work because she enjoyed them. She was made manager of the stage for the operetta. It was her first assumption of responsibility and proved to her just what she could do. She took up photography and development of pictures as a hobby. To improve her reading she had made an outline for the reading of biography throughout

the year. She does creative writing to improve oral and written expression with the hope of doing some newspaper reporting later on. She is a member of Benham Hi Publication Club, of the "home living center" group, and willingly volunteers to take part in student conferences.

As still another contrast, let us look at a student who at the beginning of school did very little other than wander in the halls. She was branded as a poor sport by most students and had only one girl-friend in the entire school. She would not enter into discussions or express any personal interests whatsoever. After she had loafed for a few days, I gave her something to do. Since she had expressed the desire to be a nurse, I put her to work on home nursing, and Mr. McCauley did a similar thing in biology. Several weeks later there was still much loafing, many temper outbursts, and much wandering in the hall. After inquiring among teachers and finding that this had been true in past years, I was at a loss to know what to do next, when quite by accident one day we had a long walk together. We found we had common interests in nature study and reading. This led to individual conferences in which she more and more freely expressed her problems. An ungovernable temper and rebellious attitude might be attributed to the fact that she had always lived in the "wrong part" of town and felt she was shunned by the other girls. She gets up every morning at four-thirty, and is probably tired in the morning. Her interests in her problems have grown, however, until now her day looks like this. She is interested in her work in meal planning. Being the oldest girl in the family of nine, she must take on her shoulders much of the responsibility for cooking. It has also meant a great deal to her to undertake the making of her own clothes. Child care is a very real problem, since she frequently takes care of younger brothers and sisters. In biology she became interested first in food experiments, later in biological phases of child development, and at the present is working on plant life and the improvement of school property.

She came to me expressing a desire to work on house planning and room arrangement, since two rooms were being added to their home and she had the privilege of furnishing and arranging her own bedroom and the kitchen. She did a practical bit of work on these rooms. This problem led her to the area of art, where she worked on the construction of a real model house and other problems of interior decoration. She has set aside one hour daily to spend reading worthwhile literature and has read some twenty-five books. She is the assistant manager of our school lunch and does the best job of cleaning up of any of my girls. Much improvement has been made in the control of her temper. She mingles freely with other girls. She is friendly and enters well into group discussions. I have not intended to present this student as a finished product. She still has a long way to go, especially when it comes to planning her work in terms of her problems. However, she has

taught me that teachers must look for more than one way to help the students who are considered problems. It is sometimes necessary to develop an awareness of needs on the part of the student.

Regardless of the student I am working with or the problem chosen by her, I have felt that it was my place to encourage each girl to take responsibility, to do a good job of planning her work over a period of time, and gradually to develop a "way of thinking" as she goes ahead on the work of her various problems.

# Evolving Concepts Affecting State High School Supervision*

By R. R. Vance
*Tennessee State High School Supervisor*

It may be somewhat platitudinous to say that state high school supervision is not what it once was. Those of us who have been engaged in high school supervision for ten or fifteen years or more have witnessed a remarkable change in our own concepts. This change is probably all the more discernible when we observe, if not the concepts, certainly the practices of those who have wrought before us in the secondary school field.

What are some of these concepts that have evolved and are evolving? In the first place, we are changing our fundamental emphasis from inspection and accreditation to stimulation and improvement. In other words, our supervision of secondary schools is becoming less and less mechanical. More attention is being paid to the qualitative aspects of a school, and the quantitative measurements are simply being regarded as a means to an end. Standards, which always connote rigidity, are being supplemented by flexible criteria.

You will notice that I say that standards, probably many of our present standards, are being supplemented by criteria. This is the same as saying that we shall always have to have a few objective measurements of secondary schools. In a word, there must first be quantity before there can be quality. For example, the library must contain books, periodicals, magazines, newspapers, a vertical file, bulletin boards, shelving space, tables, chairs, etc., all subject to objective count and measurement if you please, before it can be adequately determined how effectively the library is being used. The mistake that we have made in the past is that we have regarded the meeting of such standards as the end of our supervisory efforts and have rated our high schools according to the degree to which they have met these standards. Now, the compliance with certain mechanical or objective standards is a necessary first step in determining the effectiveness of any secondary school's program. It is not, however, the most important step. We are deeply indebted to the Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards for giving us a new concept of secondary school supervision. Some may object to the term, "new concept," saying that they have for many years regarded subjective evaluation as the most effective type of evaluation. Be that as it may, the Coöperative Study has given us a practical approach and the necessary materials for evaluating schools subjectively. The Coöperative Study

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

has helped to put us to doing what many of us heretofore have only dreamed of doing. It seems to me, therefore, that the most fundamental evolving concept of high school supervision is that which regards all the physical and quantitative aspects of a school as merely the raw materials through the use of which the school is to be properly evaluated.

Doubtless in many states this changing concept of high school supervision can be traced in the successive titles borne by that person or those persons responsible for administering secondary school standards. About thirty-one years ago in the state which I represent that person was designated "State High School Inspector." He bore this title for fourteen years, or from 1909, when a "Division of High Schools in the State Department of Education" was created by legislative enactment, to 1923. People in time grew to dislike the term inspector. "Inspector" had for them an unfortunate connotation. They identified him as one who clandestinely peeped through the key hole or through a crack in the classroom door and then passed on his way leaving the teacher in mystified wonder as to what the inspector thought of her teaching efforts. Needless to add, the inspector offered few comments or suggestions on the instructional program. As a matter of fact, he rarely stayed more than five minutes in any class. He glanced at the library, took a fleeting look at the laboratory, probably spoke to the students at the assembly hour if invited, and was soon on his way. He usually called the attention of the principal to two or three shortages in equipment before he left. He was truly an inspector or, according to the Latin derivation of the word, "one who looked in."

In 1923, the "State High School Inspector" became the "State High School Supervisor." In my state, he still bears that title. Supervision has been much more readily accepted than was inspection. The supervisor has come to be looked upon as a helper and not as a critic or chronic fault-finder. This is an evolving concept itself, if you please. Supervision is working with, and not working over, the teachers, principals, and superintendents with whom we come in contact. A prominent American educator once said while addressing a group of high school supervisors and directors: "I can soon tell whether you are an inspector or a supervisor by reading your mail for a month and by answering your telephone calls for the same length of time. If you receive few or no requests for your services in the field, you are an inspector. If the high schools in your state over which you are supposed to exercise general supervision are constantly requesting and even demanding your services, the chances are that you are a supervisor." This is truly an evolving concept of high school supervision. Our secondary schools are seeking help in doing their jobs more effectively. If we have no help to offer, we had better stay in our offices.

Strange to say, the Coöperative Study of Secondary School Standards has recently made us consider the feasibility of changing the "State High School

Supervisor" to a "State High School Evaluator." Supervisor, according to the Latin derivation of the word, means "one who sees over or above." Mere seeing over, or overseeing, may connote superficiality. Seeing above connotes "shooting over the heads" of teachers and principals, and missing their problems to an alarming degree. As already indicated, a supervisor or an evaluator must *work with* his teachers and principals, which is another way of saying that he must carry them along with him and recognize their points of view, if he is to be instrumental in enlisting the best that there is in them in making their schools better schools. I quail when I think of the tremendous responsibility which must rest upon the shoulders of the "State High School Evaluator." Of course, he is going to have to have many helpers, and it is well that he should. I have thought of the term, "Chief State High School Evaluator"; but the word, *chief*, indicates that he is termed the head man. One as humble as the average high school supervisor is does not like to be called chief.

The only serious objection in my state to the word *evaluator* has come from those English purists who have rushed to the unabridged dictionary and have returned with the report that there is no such word. I must confess that I was a bit nonplused myself when I, too, failed to find the word in a very modern unabridged dictionary. However, it is an apt word just the same, and we shall doubtless use it. Such terms as evaluate, evaluation, and evaluative are now current in the language of secondary school education. Why not evaluator?

Throughout this paper thus far, you have observed the influence of the Coöperative Study. No study in the history of American secondary education has so profoundly affected our thinking about high school supervision. This is a very broad statement, but it is intended to be just that broad. Frequently I place in one hand a bulletin entitled "High School Manual: Laws and Regulations, Program of Studies, and Curricula for Tennessee High Schools." I could just as well have placed in this hand a leaflet entitled, "Standards of the Commission on Secondary Schools of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools." In the other hand, I place a bulletin entitled "Evaluative Criteria." In one hand, I have a copy of standards, rules, and regulations. In the other hand, I have a copy of criteria. What is the difference? That difference represents an evolving concept affecting secondary education at the present time. A criterion is a means of forming a correct judgment respecting anything. It does not lend itself so readily to definite quantitative measurement as does a standard. And each criterion listed is an evaluative criterion which can not be conveniently made the basis of inspection or even of supervision, but of evaluation instead. The definition of evaluation, of course, is "act of appraising or estimating the value of." The two words certainly belong together in our present-day thinking: *evaluative* and *criteria*. They are complementary

terms, the one reinforcing the other in our evolving concept of high school supervision.

I do not believe that we can overlook the fact that our best high schools are fast becoming one of our chief concerns in the field of secondary education. We have regarded our superior high schools somewhat as we have regarded our superior students. We have never appreciably worried about our superior students. We have known that they could be counted upon to master the inflexible assignment intended for the so-called average students, and probably go a little beyond. Consequently, the teacher has devoted the greater part of her time to working with the below-average or so-called "average" students, with the result that the superior students have not achieved in accordance with their several abilities. Two or three years ago I was talking with one of my assistants. He was a very conscientious fellow. He did not find it difficult to work with high schools whose needs were quite apparent. He was finding it increasingly difficult to bring any great amount of supervisory assistance to those high schools commonly designated as superior. They were doing a superior job compared with other high schools. Therefore, the temptation was strong to drive past those schools and go on to those schools which were badly in need of supervisory guidance and help. What is our responsibility as supervisors to the superior high schools? Very fortunately indeed for some of us, the Coöperative Study appeared as a life saver. We can help them answer the question, "What can I do to make my school a better school?" I have just quoted from the purposes of the Coöperative Study as expressed or implied in four challenging questions listed on page one of the 1940 edition of the manual entitled *How to Evaluate a Secondary School.* The best high schools in our respective states can continuously evaluate themselves and still be conscious of the fact that there is much room for improvement. Not only that, the area or areas in greatest need of improvement will be brought to light, and the general direction in which continued growth and development may take place will be indicated. Truly, the "evaluative criteria" are for us a godsend as we exercise supervision over our best schools. This is a concept worth noting.

Finally, I am convinced that most of us have evolved new concepts affecting the philosophy of secondary education. We are quite certain that the program of a school will be more or less directionless unless that school has a definitely expressed philosophy of secondary education. You will notice that I said *definitely expressed philosophy of secondary education.* Many of my high school principals, when asked if they had a philosophy of secondary education, have replied something as follows: "Oh, yes! I have a philosophy of secondary education, but I have never written it down. I don't even know that I have ever expressed it orally." That is just about the same as the student's stock answer to the teacher's question, "I know, but I can't tell it."

Heretofore, we have apparently taken our philosophy of secondary education for granted. We knew that there must be one, but we have not troubled ourselves to find out what it might be. Worse still, those of us who boasted of formulated philosophies probably had appropriated them from others who had set them down as their own. A philosophy worthy of the name is an individual and personal possession. For me it must be *my* philosophy; for you it must be *your* philosophy. To become truly mine, it must be thought through by me; it can not be plagiarized. Any similarities between my philosophy and yours must be coincidental.

I am reminded of a letter which I received from one of my high school principals a few months ago. He said that he had purchased the *Evaluative Criteria* at my request and was studying all the principal Coöperative Study publications preparatory to making an evaluation of his own school. (So far he was doing well.) However, he informed me that he and his teaching staff were experiencing unusual difficulty in formulating a statement or in formulating statements embracing a philosophy of secondary education, the essential features of which at least all would accept. The concluding sentence of this letter was: "Please send me by return mail about a half dozen statements of philosophy of secondary education, as I understand you have several in your files." I did not honor this request except to make two or three suggestions calculated to assist him and his teaching corps to do the job which he was apparently willing to do by following the line of least resistance and appropriating some one else's philosophy. Probably some of us fail to remember that we were once practically as stumped as was this principal.

In summary, I shall itemize as follows the evolving concepts affecting high school supervision which I have discussed in this paper:

1. Stimulation of high schools to further growth and development through self-analysis, self-evaluation, and self-improvement, this stimulation to be effected by a substitution of evaluation for inspection and by a supplementation of standards of measurement with criteria;
2. Acceptance of supervision as a means of helping teachers grow in service, the antithesis of this type of supervision being a type of supervision sometimes called "snoopervision" which merely finds weaknesses and makes no suggestions for eliminating them;
3. The widespread demand for supervisory assistance and guidance not only on the high school level but also on the elementary school level;
4. The challenge to assist superior high schools to continue growth; and
5. The formulation of a workable philosophy of secondary education.

# The Preparation of Teachers*

By Doak S. Campbell
*Dean, Graduate School, George Peabody College for Teachers*

Without doubt, there are many evolving concepts which affect the work of Southern secondary schools. It is exceedingly difficult, however, to define or describe these concepts or to state precisely the manner in which their application appears in practice. At times one is moved almost to the point of exasperation because of a seeming lack of definiteness on the part of some who sponsor one or another of the numerous innovating practices in our secondary schools. Our almost too thoroughgoing development of standardization of practice during the past twenty-five years makes it exceedingly difficult to see just wherein some of the present concepts can possibly be wrought into our patterns of practice.

Probably the most significant aspect of the development of educational practice during the past decade is that which relates to teacher education. Indeed, one may well characterize the outstanding curriculum movements of the past few years as a program of large-scale in-service education of teachers. Practically every state in the area covered by the Southern Association has engaged in such an enterprise on a statewide basis during the past ten years. Concurrent with these efforts have been concerted movements to improve the pre-service preparation of teachers in institutions of higher learning. Each of these major aspects of teacher education is here presented briefly.

## In-Service Education

In recent years pressure to make the secondary schools more effective has become intense. Insistence upon the improvement of the curriculum has been so strong that it has no longer seemed feasible to await the slow process of working out theoretical concepts in the curriculum of the higher institutions and then expecting them to find expression ultimately in the high school classroom. Furthermore, it has been recognized that experienced high school teachers who are in daily contact with pupils have much to contribute to the immediate improvement of instruction.

One of the principal assumptions underlying this movement has been the assumption that if instructional procedures are to undergo any significant change, there must be first a change in the point of view of the individual teacher. It was not considered sufficient for the "experts" to work out their theories in courses of study or other formulae to be handed down to teachers with administrative orders that they be put into practice. No matter how

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Secondary Schools and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

much such materials were refined, it was usually difficult to discover any significant influence upon procedures in the classroom as a result of their use. Gradually it became apparent that progress in improving instruction would be made only as teachers were stimulated to study proposed ways of improvement and were encouraged to explore the application of suggested procedures in their own classrooms. Thus there have developed various types of professional study groups in which large numbers of teachers have participated. As a rule, such groups began with immediate problems in their own schools. Needless to say, much immature thinking took place. Many attempts were made to apply concepts which had been given currency in educational literature but which had not been matured by the teachers. In many instances such attempts resulted in confusion from which teachers and administrators retreated to the security of their former and more traditional position. In the main, however, those teachers who matured their thinking regarding newer concepts achieved some degree of success from the exploratory process and were thus encouraged to extend the scope of their efforts to improve. Gradually there began to emerge certain philosophic points of view and types of school practice upon which more and more teachers could agree.

The work of the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research with the thirty-three selected high schools represents an intensive effort in this respect. This enterprise is essentially a program of teacher education on the job. To begin with, schools were selected whose faculties were aware of current concepts regarding the improvement of the work of the high schools. Their teachers were accustomed to work coöperatively in the development of the total instructional program of the school. Their administrative officers were interested in making administration subordinate to instruction. In order to provide a wider opportunity for the exchange of points of view, representatives from the selected schools have been brought together in summer work conferences for an extended period of intensive work. Plans for working certain concepts out in practice have been discussed critically. Reports of the results of innovating practices have been given careful appraisal. Critical evaluation of results has been attempted. Reports presented to the Association last year and also this year give evidence of unquestioned growth in the application of certain educational concepts in these selected schools. These evidences are not stated in detail in this paper since they are to appear in the report of the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research and will be printed in the proceedings of the Association.

Through members of a central staff the entire faculties of the selected schools have been stimulated to work coöperatively during the school year, and many faculty members have modified their teaching as a result. One needs but to visit one of these schools, or any one of dozens of other high

schools in the South where teachers are at work along similar lines, to see evidences of teacher growth as a result of this type of in-service education.

### Pre-Service Education

Due to the fact that much of the leadership for the in-service education of teachers has come from higher institutions, the results have been brought to bear in some measure upon the curriculum of those institutions. In a large number of colleges and universities, perhaps a majority of those in which the education of teachers is a major enterprise, techniques for co-operative work on the part of teachers are now being utilized on the campus. Courses have been modified in many instances, especially courses that deal with educational theory and practice. Probably one of the most wholesome indications with respect to the teacher education curriculum is that of increased effort to bring educational theory and actual practice into closer relationship. You may recall that the study of teacher education sponsored by the Association in 1934, which gave great impetus to the present movement, pointed out this relationship as a problem of major importance.

Not only have departments and schools of education endeavored to bring their practice schools into closer relationship with regular course work, but they have also extended the relationship to public schools within the immediate area served by the higher institutions. Faculty members have become consultants to schools or school systems and thus, while giving assistance to teachers in the schools, have been able to bring to the campus specific information regarding the problems of instruction as they are encountered in the field. There are some evidences of significant changes in the college program in an attempt to meet the needs thus discovered. There are many evidences of a wholesome disturbance of the complacency of college faculties as a result of this practice. The results are not confined altogether to departments of education. Academic departments in many institutions have boldly attacked the problem of teacher education both separately and in coöperation with other departments. And, while there seems to be comparatively little general agreement as to any one "best" plan for reorganization, there does seem to be considerable agreement that some fundamental reorganization is desirable.

Thus we see, in both pre-service and in-service education of teachers, among both high school teachers and principals on the one hand and among college faculties on the other, a great deal of concern for and activity in the improvement of educational procedures. It seems reasonable to hope that through this process of interaction between the secondary schools and higher institutions evolving concepts of secondary education will tend to become more mature and our American youth will profit thereby.

A word of caution at this point seems not to be out of place. We should

refrain from trying to rush the process. Inherent in the present program is the concept that improvement in the schools depends largely on teacher growth, and that growth is a process which cannot be greatly accelerated without harmful result. It cannot proceed uniformly among different individuals and in different places. It cannot easily be standardized. As a people and as a profession we crave formulae. We strive to develop professional people by the short process of exposure to *ad hoc* courses. We deny too often in our practices our professed belief in the process of growth.

One of my colleagues received a letter from the head of a college which was in process of being established. It read: "In establishing ——— college we are anxious that the institution may have the finest college traditions. Won't you please list, therefore, a half dozen of the most important traditions of your institution so that we may adopt them?"

It is true that our present efforts are attended by much confusion. To me this is a hopeful sign. It is significant that many of us are aware of the confusion and, being aware of it, are diligently trying to find ways out of it. That administrators, teachers, experts, and even laymen are working cooperatively should give us confidence that better teachers will be developed and better educational opportunities will be provided for our youth.

# The Implications of the Southern Association Study For Teacher Education*

By Roscoe E. Parker
*Professor of English, the University of Tennessee*

In the "blissful and never to be forgotten age" of Wouter Van Twiller, according to the *History of New York by Diedrich Knickerbocker*, "everything was better than it has ever been since, or ever will be again." "Happily for New Amsterdam," says Diedrich, "the very words of learning, education, taste, and talents were unheard of. . . . No man, in fact, seemed to know more than his neighbor, nor any man to know more than an honest man ought to know, who has nobody's business to mind but his own. . . . In those days nobody meddled with concerns above his comprehension; nor thrust his nose into other people's affairs; nor neglected to correct his own conduct, and reform his own character, in his zeal to pull to pieces the character of others."

Those days "of blissful ignorance and lowly simplicity" antedate Columbia University with its Teachers' College, New York University and City College, Town Hall and Radio City, compulsory school attendance, the "Regents Inquiry," and the Southern Association Study. But "this dulcet period," as Diedrich Knickerbocker wrote of his own time, "were I even able to depict (it), would be but little understood by the degenerate age for which I am doomed to write." For in this age we meet frequently to consider the many aspects and problems of education and learning because we believe that they are a vital part of everybody's business. The Southern Association Study is one evidence of this belief and of our concern about the deeds as well as the words of learning, education, taste, and talents. My subject is itself a recognition of the fact that teacher education lies at the very heart of this concern, of the fact that without adequately educated teachers there can be no effective education in either our secondary schools or our higher institutions of learning.

My thesis may be stated by repeating some remarks made before the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research in 1936. These are the remarks I then made and now wish to develop: "Administrative officers and school organization can provide the materials and the conditions for good teaching, but they cannot teach. Educational research and theory may develop new techniques and help us to free ourselves from the fetters of tradition, but they cannot educate boys and girls. Their education is the result of their own efforts, efforts which are most satisfactorily expended under the

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

stimulation and direction of good teachers. The fundamental problems of education, therefore, are the teacher's problems."[1] Since that time (not, I hasten to add, as a result of anything I have said or done) others have given expression to similar ideas; and the Southern Association has encouraged, as an integral part of the Southern Study, the establishment of a series of summer conferences for the further education of teachers. Hence it becomes necessary for us to consider what adequate teacher-education is, what the philosophy of the Southern Association Study is, and what significance the Study may have for those institutions engaged in the education of teachers.

Not long ago President William Allan Neilson published an article with the categorical title, "Education Can't Be Better Than the Teachers."[2] In this article he stated both the necessity for good teachers and some of the qualities demanded of them. Concerning the need for teachers, he said: "The closer one comes in observation and experience to the actual process of education, the more one is convinced that the crux of the problem is the difficulty of finding or training good teachers and enough of them. Every school principal, every college president, is aware that, whatever may be said about unemployed teachers or excess of supply over demand, it is all but impossible to select a staff thoroughly adequate in personality, equipment, and zest."

He then listed the following characteristics of good teachers: "First stands personality. The stimulation of youth to learning demands sympathy, vivacity, and devotion—a belief that the task is worth putting into it all one's energies. Next comes general culture, intellectual and social. The teacher must himself be a cultivated person. Then comes the equipment in special knowledge of the subject taught; and, finally, expertness in the devices that have been contrived for rousing interest, for presenting information, and for evolving thinking. . . ." Most of us, I imagine, would like to add to these qualifications another without which those listed are of little worth. I should call it the ability and determination to grow in culture, knowledge, and expertness in contriving with colleagues and students devices and situations which will promote educational growth.

One concern of the Southern Association Study is finding and developing more teachers who have these qualifications. And the Study is itself evidence that this Association recognized long before Dean Holmes of Harvard proclaimed to the world the fact that today "The Nation Challenges the Schools."[3] Most of us will probably agree with Dean Holmes "that public education has become a national interest in a radically new sense; that it must therefore be taken far more seriously and studied far more carefully and supported far more fully than ever in the world before; and that the

[1] Roscoe E. Parker, "Significant Trends in High School Teaching," *Southern Association Quarterly*, 1, 286; August, 1937.
[2] Partially reprinted from *Survey Graphic* in the *Bulletin* of the A. A. U. P., XXV, 590-596.
[3] Henry W. Holmes, "The Nation Challenges the Schools." *Atlantic Monthly* CLXV, 20-27.

development of professional personnel for schools and the advancement of professional knowledge in education through the universities is of the essence. I still maintain," he says, "that, if these things are so, a considerable part of current educational controversy is fiddling while Rome burns. . . ."

Dean Holmes then states clearly some of the problems which the Southern Association Study is now exploring in experimental schools and summer conferences. "The very heart of the matter," he says, "is that we ought not to give all young people the same education—not in amount, nor in kind, nor in result. . . . Yet the youth of America must be offered an education which is equal in the sense that it is adequate (as adequate as we know how to make it) to each individual's need as a citizen in a democracy—in *this* democracy."

If this task is to be accomplished, the argument continues, "the whole process of education must be individualized at certain crucial points. Teaching must be lifted out of its routine; perfunctory 'marking' must be changed to give counselors more information when they seek reasons for failure and try to touch new springs of action in the pupil; the possible choices among subjects and activities must be increased, which means inevitably that many small secondary schools must be consolidated. When graduates of high schools begin to come back to their schools whenever they fail to establish themselves satisfactorily in the adult community *because they know their schools can do more than any other agency to get them started right*, we shall be sure the necessary revolution in school-keeping has taken place."

These conditions are far different from those which existed in New Amsterdam, the "ever to be envied little Burgh . . . without ambition, without vainglory, without riches, without learning, and all their train of carking cares." But the participants in the Southern Association Study are determined, if I sense their attitude aright, that the schools of the South shall become adequate to these modern conditions. They are engaged, in the words of the Executive Committee, "in developing sound and comprehensive programs of instruction which are meeting the needs of all pupils." Moreover, "It is the conviction of this Commission, supported by evidence, that the skillful teacher, with sound scholarship in subject matter and with keen understanding of the capacities and interests of boys and girls, is a safer guide for the education of boys and girls in the secondary schools than a rigid pattern fixed by inflexibly specified unit requirements." And they are convinced that "the key to the development of the programs . . . is the teacher."

The emphasis upon capable teachers who can work with pupils in meeting their needs and solving their problems is important. It means the recognition of individuality as "one of the principal ingredients of human happiness, and quite the chief ingredient of individual and social progress." It means that student personalities, interests, and modes of behavior are to be

given serious consideration. It means, in short, teacher guidance and pupil self-determination.

Let me illustrate by quotation the functioning of this philosophy of education which we accept in theory but frequently deny in practice.

"He who lets the world, or his own portion of it, choose his plan of life for him, has no need of any other faculty than the ape-like one of imitation. He who chooses his plan for himself, employs all his faculties. He must use observation to see, reasoning and judgment to foresee, activity to gather materials for decision, discrimination to decide, and when he has decided, firmness and self-control to hold to his deliberate decision. And these qualities he requires and exercises exactly in proportion as the part of his conduct which he determines according to his own judgment and feeling is a large one. . . . Human nature is not a machine built after a model, and set to do exactly the work prescribed for it, but a tree, which requires to grow and develop itself on all sides, according to the tendency of the inward forces which make it a living thing. . . .

"It is not by wearing down into uniformity all that is individual in themselves, but by cultivating it and calling it forth, within the limits imposed by the rights and interests of others, that human beings become a noble and beautiful object of contemplation; and as the works partake the character of those who do them, by the same process human life also becomes rich, diversified, and animating, furnishing more abundant aliment to high thoughts and elevating feelings, and strengthening the tie which binds every individual to the race, by making the race infinitely better worth belonging to. In proportion to the development of his individuality, each person becomes more valuable to himself, and is therefore capable of being more valuable to others. There is a greater fulness of life about his own existence, and when there is more life in the units there is more in the mass which is composed of them."

These statements were published in 1858 by John Stuart Mill in the third chapter of his essay *On Liberty*. They constitute, in spite of their age, what I believe to be a sound statement of the philosophy which underlies the work of the Southern Association Study and of the principles which must determine the education of teachers for the immediate future. But there is a danger in the application of this philosophy. The danger is that our emphasis upon personality and individual experience may be of the wrong kind. Mr. Theodore Spencer believes that we have not been sufficiently imaginative in our emphasis upon individual experience, that we have not defined the kind of individuality we have been trying to develop, and that we have not clearly understood what we mean by experience.[4]

[4] Theodore Spencer, "The Responsibility of the English Teacher," *College English*, I, 589-594.

"The implications of this state of affairs," he says, "are dangerous. For the teacher, searching to discover what will either interest the student or be of practical use to him, is doing two related and ominous things : he is making the student an egotist and he is shriveling his imagination. He is telling the student that because a thing happened to *him*, it is therefore important ; and that *his* interests are more vital than any other interests."

These are called parasitical procedures too little concerned with significant "changes inside the individual." These changes, Mr. Spencer believes, "should be based on two things : on a sense of values that is not merely local and on an imaginative comprehension." Neither of these, he admits, "is easy to define, neither is easy to cultivate, and against both there are fighting a set of tendencies and obstacles which are extremely difficult to overcome."

If, therefore, we are to build in the South neither a fool's paradise nor an educational pandemonium, we must have teachers educated to work effectively with boys and girls in achieving the values and avoiding the dangers inherent in this philosophy of education which is now emerging. And if we are to have such teachers, we must plan significant changes in their selection, their education, their certification, and their participation in the educative process.

There can be little difference of opinion concerning the necessity for a more careful selection than has heretofore been exercised of those who are to be educated as teachers. We need not commit ourselves to the fallacy that teachers are born and not made. Neither should we subscribe to the opposite fallacy that every college graduate who has been exposed to a certain number of courses in a variety of subjects, including educational philosophy and methodology, is *ipso facto* a teacher. Certainly those who have little native ability or intellectual curiosity and no aptitude for working with boys and girls should not be admitted to candidacy for teacher's certificates or given certificates if they have been erroneously admitted to candidacy. But the problem is complicated because of economic conditions, insecurity of teacher tenure, and political implications. I must therefore leave its solution to the wisdom of deans and their guidance personnel.

The philosophy of the Southern Association Study implies the necessity for more rather than less general education than most of our college curricula or certification regulations now demand. And this means higher quality as well as greater quantity. Too few of our teachers have any adequate experience with the impacts of the various sciences, political systems, economic theories and practices, social and religious philosophies, psychologies, or languages and literatures upon modern life and its problems. Nor are they likely to gain such experience in meeting the minimum requirements of our college curricula as they are now ordained. This may mean that we need to reorganize our entire program of general education, that we need to extend

the time now devoted to general education, or that we need to make radical differentiations in the general educational programs and procedures of those who are to teach. The problem should undoubtedly be a joint concern of the two Commissions participating in this meeting.

Paradoxical as the statement may seem at first, the concern of the Southern Association Study with the needs and problems of adolescent boys and girls implies a need for more teachers who are specialists in definite fields of knowledge and are proficient in related fields. The statement that all teachers should be specialists in adolescent boys and girls is too glib and easy to be meaningful. If our teachers are not to be blind leaders of blind students into blind alleys, they must be prepared to give proficient guidance service in the solutions of problems which require special knowledge and skill. They can prepare themselves to render expert guidance in fields of special interests only by building specialized knowledge on an adequate foundation of general education. It may not be possible to do this in the four years now generally allotted to collegiate education, but it must be done for both prospective teachers and for teachers now in service. The Southern Association conferences to be held in nine institutions this summer are one step toward meeting this need for effective specialization. Other facilities are already provided, but neither the facilities nor the results are yet adequate to our needs.

The experiences gained by teachers in our schools and colleges of education are apparently no more adequate than those gained in other special fields. The ability of the teacher who has met all certification requirements to coöperate effectively with students, faculty, and community in recognizing and working toward a solution of common problems frequently leaves much to be desired. Teachers obviously need more expert knowledge of and more adequate experience with educational philosophy and psychology and methodology. But this knowledge and experience must be more intimately related to school situations and student problems in the future than in the past. One tentative proposal for achieving these ends has been offered. Briefly, this is a proposal that the preparation of prospective teachers in the fields of professional education be developed coöperatively in four areas: adolescence and child development, psychology and its applications, the function of the school in a democracy, and practical experience with children. It is believed that such a program would provide a flexibility which would meet the interests, needs, and special abilities of most teachers.

This proposal is consistent with one other important implication of the Southern Association Study for teacher education. If teachers are to work understandingly and democratically with parents, teachers, and students, they must learn to work that way before they become teachers. It is a truism that teachers generally teach as they have been taught. Hence it

becomes important that we should so plan our programs of teacher education that we may give future teachers ample opportunity to gain experience as students in working as they will need to work as teachers. Such planning may discard much of our lecture memorization procedure in teacher education. It will certainly provide for individual work on individual problems, group work on common problems, and consultation and guidance services on all problems. It must, I think, provide for vast changes in our present methods of teacher education. And I am supported in this opinion by nearly all the teachers who participated in our conference held last summer in cooperation with the Southern Association Study.

Many, if not all, of the implications here stated will be generally accepted in theory; but there is danger in neglecting to carry them into practice. If we believe that the teacher is the key to the development of better educational programs for the South, we must do more than pay lip service to this confession of faith. The Commission on Higher Institutions can do much to provide adequate facilities for teachers now in service and for prospective teachers still in the colleges and universities which it represents. It can do much to further the selection and education of outstanding students who can assume leadership in extending and improving educational opportunities in the South. In coöperation with the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research it can discover, adopt, and continue necessary improvements in plans and procedures for the education of teachers.

Allow me, in closing, to offer three concrete suggestions dealing with certification, supervision, and school operation—suggestions which, if they are accepted, may promote better teacher education and better teaching by those who are educated.

Although participating teachers are practically unanimous in the opinion that the conference plan of education now being promoted by this Association is superior to any type of teacher education previously offered, there is no assurance that work in these conferences, or in other programs which may employ procedures developed in these conferences, will be accepted by certification officials in lieu of prescribed courses. Until such assurance is given, the Southern Association Study cannot become the force that it might otherwise become either in teacher education or in its influence on general education. But I must leave this suggestion as a foundling on the doorsteps of the Commission on Secondary Education, confident that its members will provide the sustenance and environment essential to the growth of the waif into a useful member of society.

As for supervision as it is now practiced in many of our schools, the least that can be said is that it is the enemy of all democratic procedures in working with children. No teacher can evolve with students effective methods of working together under the eye of a dictatorial supervisor. The kind of supervision properly selected and adequately educated teachers need is the

kind that provides them with proficient consultation and guidance services in order that they may be free to work effectively with their students toward satisfactory solutions of their problems. The kind of services needed will depend upon the kinds of problems to be solved. And these needs must be determined by teachers and students rather than by authoritative remote control.

Finally, the administration of some of our schools is the very antithesis of any imaginable concept of democracy. So long as teachers play no vital role in the formulation of school policies, in the selection of their colleagues, and in the conduct of community affairs, there can be no educational democracy. It is a curious anomaly that our schools, theoretically our most democratic institutions, should be controlled by a hierarchy of school boards, administrative officials, and supervisors analogous to that in any efficient industrial plant. Under such a system, teachers become hired hands and pupils the raw materials with which the hired hands work. Human beings are not machines, and the factory system is not a model for building a democratic way of education. I bequeath the solution of this problem jointly to all the Commissions comprising this Association and urge that they hold its solution as a sacred obligation of themselves and of all who do follow after them.

These are some of the implications of the Southern Association Study, as I see them, for the education of teachers in our colleges and universities, in our communities, and in our schools. For the education of the teacher is never an accomplished fact; it is a continuous process. It is our business as teachers, as parents, and as citizens to further this process in order that our system of public education may, as Dean Holmes puts it, "accomplish the enormous task of adjusting each succeeding generation to our civilization, with all its complexities . . . without exploitation of any class or group and without presenting unnecessary obstacles to progress toward maximum economic productivity, the achievement of social justice and efficient government, of the attainment of beauty, truth, and brotherhood among us."

# The Influence of the Liberal Arts College on Life in Our Democracy*

By Shelton Phelps
*President, Winthrop College*

In order to determine the place and influence of the liberal arts college on democracy, it is well to know: first, what are the fundamental purposes of a liberal arts college; second, by what methods is the realization of those purposes sought; and third, to what extent are these same purposes realized. As the many colleges coming under this classification are considered and as the sources which treat of the liberal arts college are studied, what seems the most defensible generalization groups these colleges into two classes. These might be called the traditional type, and the newer type liberal arts college.

In considering first the traditional type, or if it is preferred, the historical type liberal arts college, one of the very best sources found is by President Henry M. Wriston, now of Brown University, and published by the Lawrence College Press, 1937, entitled *The Nature of a Liberal College*. Quoting from its preface (dated January, 1937): "There is no quarrel here with vocational, technical, or professional training. They have an indispensable function. The point insisted upon is that schools devoted to those subjects are not liberal colleges, and that colleges which imitate such schools lose their liberal character."

It is President Wriston's view that a liberal education, like religion, and like love, is an experience. By an experience he means going through a process by which the individual is "forever changed." It is not training for doing a specific task but rather a period of growth through which one reaches full intellectual stature.

As he discusses the institutional form which is to produce a liberal education, Wriston after dwelling upon the extreme difficulty of producing institutionally a liberal education, as cloth is produced in a factory, says again that a liberal education is not something to be produced but something to be experienced. The thought is repeated that the liberal arts college is linked to the past, and it must continue linked to the past. It cannot deal with the future, it must deal with the past. It cannot be adapted to its environment, it must overcome its environment. But here the biological analogy brings trouble.

Now if the liberal arts college is not by its nature best fitted to its surroundings, then in the struggle for survival it would seem it must give place to a form which is better fitted to survive. But an analogy sooner or later gets

* An address delivered over radio station WSB, Atlanta, Georgia, April 9, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

the reasoner into trouble: why cling to the illusion that the liberal arts college is a plant at variance with its environment striving because of its attachments to the past to overcome its environment. Why not think of the liberal arts college for what it literally is, a social institution, fitted to ever changing conditions to keep pace with which it must be itself constantly changing and adapting itself to its surroundings. What are some of the changes it would need to make?

Must it give up being a process by which the individual, who possesses a liberal education, has been "changed forever"? And if this change of the individual by the process is for the betterment of the individual, adapting him as it adapts itself, would the end result be a service to Democracy? What are some of the adaptations to environment which the liberal arts college can make to its changing surroundings which will draw it into closer relation to the democracy which surrounds it?

There is here a point which should be considered. The original arts college was imported to this country from England. John Harvard's Harvard was but an English importation. In England, in the main the arts college has been an institution to develop an educational elite. The question is, must the liberal arts college cling so closely to its past that it will require a highly selected student body in order that it be successful? Is there an alternate type? One that has been adapted and modified somewhat by its environment? Does the American liberal arts college differ from its English prototype?

And now consider this second type, called the newer type, as it is treated by a second source. A little later perhaps than the publishing of President Wriston's very interesting analysis of the liberal arts college, President Raymond Walters of the urban University of Cincinnati published a study on the same subject. A different type study, it seemingly describes a different style of institution. It does seem more nearly to describe the American liberal arts college of today. Perhaps where President Wriston was describing the liberal arts college as he thought it should be, President Walters was more nearly describing the American liberal arts college as it is found to exist. Perhaps one writer viewed the school idealistically, the other practically. At any rate these differences seem to exist and to account for two different types of the liberal arts college.

First study the matter of the selection of students. In the earlier concept of the liberal arts college, the purpose was to develop an *educational elite*. To do this most effectively presupposes a somewhat rigorous selection of entrants. This in the past was accomplished in two ways: first, by entrance examinations, always a more effective means of elimination than the certificate or transcript; second, by the greater elimination practiced in the more purely preparatory secondary than is practiced in the present day high school. Now it seems it should be admitted, if a clear view is to be had of

the present situation, that many of the liberal arts colleges must spend more time and efforts securing students than they can spend either in selecting or in the elimination of these same entrants. This is not intended to be a highly critical statement but simply a statement of fact in regard to existing conditions. Rather plainly, however, the results of such a situation provide a student body only slightly, not rigorously, selected, and offer instead of the purpose of developing an educational elite, the very different purpose of teaching this newer type student body a modicum of the liberal arts, and perhaps in terms of President Wriston's formulae, of subjecting it to only a part of that process which shall leave its members forever changed.

Consider a civilization which does not intend, as its basic purpose, the development of an educational elite but which intends rather to seek culture to the highest approximate degree compatible with also securing that same degree for the most people. Under such social conditions, will the traditional type liberal arts college exert effectively so strong an influence as the newer type? So long as in ancient Greece there existed a selected few freed from the more onerous tasks of earning a living, that same few, if it could be assumed they were intellectually superior, would exist to be served by the type of college best suited to that leisure and type intellect. So long as such an elite, whether it be a landed agricultural aristocracy or on what basis it would flourish, would demand a type of institution separating them from their fellows and perpetuating their differences. But when changing conditions have swept aside, or are sweeping aside, these differences, then it seems gravely questionable that so much can be done for the many except by a modified type of institution. This newer liberal arts college, not quite so strongly committed to the past, frequently looking into the future, though President Wriston says it cannot do so, seems then more in accord with the logic of the situation.

Consider also that this present system accepts frequently the responsibility of that learning, or that developed culture if preferred, of making better both the economic and the social position of the learners. Then it would seem as a corollary the institution must accept the responsibility of finding suitable positions for its graduates. Does it thereby cease to be a liberal arts college? And if it is to be predicated that it does cease to be such, for this reason is it not quite probable that this type of school will cease to exist? For without doubt, the gravest problem confronting college education in general, and society in general, is the problem of the four millions of unemployed youth between the ages of sixteen and twenty-five. Which institution —the traditional type liberal arts college or the modified type which seems to exist in growing numbers—will do more for this same youth problem?

And finally, consider that college accepting that new premise of learning proposed by Thurstone of Chicago, which in brief is that there are various types of learning, perhaps some six or seven in number, and similarly six or

seven various types of learners; that we are not all different degrees of ability necessarily as measured upon a longitudinal scale—one this tall mentally, another taller mentally, a third less tall than either of the first two, a fourth taller than any of these, and a fifth the shortest of the group; but instead of such varying degrees of ability we perhaps vary by types and that a half-dozen learners might be of equal height mentally but of different types. One might learn logically, another experimentally, a third who learns easily by measurements of quantity, and a fourth learning such things as the languages. Now to select one type as an educational elite and to reject others equally capable in their types of learning could hardly be defended as democratic. Why should one type have more privileges than another type, assuming that the degree of learning among several types is approximately the same.

## Summary

And regarding the relative effect of these two types of liberal arts college on democracy, when the purposes of the two types are considered, it would seem almost obvious that the latter type is the more democratic. Certainly it is the more democratic in the sense that it provides for more types according to the special abilities of those types, that it does not pick out one type and elevate it at the expense of other types of learning.

When the methods of obtaining results are considered, which is the more democratic? Is it better to subject all the various types of learners existing in society to one set of methods of learning? To let those who are adapted to this type of learning flourish and others fall out? Does it not seem better to adapt the methods of learning, even the things to be learned, to the learners? Is it not more democratic to develop each student to a near maximum of his abilities as those abilities are circumscribed by his aptitudes than to cause many to fall out without learning because of the choice of thing to be studied and the methods of learning?

And finally as to the degree of achievement which is obtained. No one would seriously question that with an educational elite the degree of achievement could be expected to be higher in that learning to which they are best suited than if all types were subjected to the same methods of study and same content. Which would, however, be the better—different types of learning and different degrees of achievement for the many, or the one type in which higher achievement is found for the few? The only answer would seem to be found in the final aggregate, and simple arithmetic would make it seem probable that the second type would furnish the greater aggregate.

The last word on the subject should answer which would be the type of institution to be maintained in a democracy. And the answer would just as obviously seem to be that a democracy can afford both types of institutions. There is no reason why in a democracy colleges for the one type, traditionally called the select, should not exist, and that type should be de-

veloped to the highest possible extent. It is equally true, however, that in a democracy colleges for the many types should exist and should be developed to the extent that all may have opportunity of maximum development in terms of their own aptitudes and abilities. The only question then would be which shall be called liberal arts. This, after all, is a matter of definition; and definitions are arbitrary. But perhaps it is straining at too fine a distinction to strive to place the name exclusively on either group.

# Education in the Secondary Schools of the South*

By Howard W. Odum
*Professor of Sociology, University of North Carolina*

Readers of books used to have a way of saying that the purpose of a preface was for the author to explain why he did not include in his discussion the things that he should have included and why he did include those things which he should not have included. My own feeling is that the purpose of the preface to a book or an introduction to a talk is not that, but to point out that the subject being discussed is about the most important topic which it is possible to consider. It is with some such attitude that we approach the subject of education in the secondary schools in the South. This seems true both because of the basic importance of the subject in a changing education and because of the role which the secondary school plays in this changing drama of American education. There are certain other perhaps self-evident assumptions which appear basic to our consideration.

One of these is that American Youth and their realistic education in close living harmony with their American and regional environment constitutes one of the key problems, considered by many the chiefest of all problems, in American education. Another assumption which seems universally accepted by school people throughout the country, as well as by publicists and statesmen in general, is that the objective of this education must be mastery of the physical, technical, and cultural forces which sweep down upon us, and that this mastery must be turned to human-use ends through a regular democracy, which shall guarantee the continuity of human development through a superior mankind and more adequate human society.

If this is true, another assumption follows; namely, that education for youth must mean education and preparation for their participation in the American dream commensurate with the guarantees of American democracy. This means that there must be a revitalized interpretation of Americanism to understand and to utilize our great resources and our regional diversity through the development of which only can the greatness of America be continued. This means that youth must understand the twofold basis of Americanism: one, the living geography and resources of a great continent which distinguish it from Europe or Asia or Africa; and the other, the living background of our political, historical, and cultural ideals.

Before the American Dream, was Nature, primal in its grandeur and abundance, primeval in its years of as many seasons as the mind of man can contemplate. Before Man and his Society, before Plymouth and Jamestown,

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

was the American continent, later symbol and reality of a new world apart from Europe or Asia or Africa. In the ever-resurging quest for "Something to prove this puzzle, the new world," it is good to remember that before Man on this continent was this Nature, prolific and powerful, kind in its nurture, ruthless in its laws, alike merciful and merciless, the eternal creator and creature of living societies.

Before there were men to hear and see and feel there were crashing thunder and forked lightning, frigid cold and torrid heat, eastern sunshine and western rains, storms over a thousand mountain tops, floods in countless valleys. And there were growing things in limitless abundance, millions of quick, heart-throbbing beasts of the fields and birds of the air and countless symbols of glory and brilliance in the flowering colors of trees and plants. And there was abundance of fruits and harvests, seasons of springtime and summer, of autumn and winter. And there were the successions of living things, millions following millions, in the life and death of the ever-cycling nature-world. And there were such variety and abundance, such vastness and expanse, such glory-vistas and mystery as had not been hitherto recorded in the annals of the earth.

With reference to that Americanism, grounded in the high purposes of American institutions and democracy, it is important for us to renew our intentions to make of America a society at its best, as an age-long ideal in which God, man, and nature, working together, create a society at its best. This means, of course, America at her best, each region at its best, each state at its best. In particular, therefore, we should come ultimately to examine education in the secondary schools of the South with a view to a program of education, through which Southern youth would develop the South at its best.

I find myself tempted to venture a twofold approach to the discussion of this most important topic, combining the methods of the professor and the politician. This, of course, would seem to be a difficult undertaking. The professor, you know, always knows exactly how it should be done, and the politician always promises something good in the end!

In the case of "The South at its Best," it is very clear that we have a difficult situation, on the one hand, to say what is best and, on the other, to say how we shall bring it about. Who, for instance, is to be the judge of what is the best?

It must be clear, therefore, that our statement of desirable and attainable ends of Southern regional development must be in terms that are flexible, comprehensive, enduring, and commensurate with the cultural, economic, and social framework of our American democracy. Our attainable standards must be stated in terms of capacities of growth, of development of natural resources and people, of the devotion of the people and their wealth to institutional services through which we seek a balance and equilibrium between

the people and wealth, between men and technology, between culture and civilization. We do not, therefore, say the "South at its Best" is a wealthy South, or an industrial South, or an agrarian South; but we say that "The South at its Best" is a growing South, a developing South, utilizing, developing, and conserving all of its resources in a balanced economy, of, for, and by the people, and of, for, and by all of the institutions. Its specific objectives and its specific needs will then be worked out in relation to each diversified phase of life, each changing situation, and in the combined and cooperative work of all acting together. Now, if I may, I shall continue our discussion after the manner of the professor by asking a few questions. And I propose to answer them, too, if you accept my verdict. Here are the questions:

What is the nature of the regional economy of the South at the present or in the very recent past?

What is the difference between the present economy and the desired optimum?

What are attainable standards and developments of the immediate future?

What resources, procedures, and facilities will be required to make up this difference?

How may the region acquire the resources and facilities to make up this difference?

And finally what are the best ways, the best steps, of going about obtaining these resources?

If we oversimplify these questions and restate them in a way which apparently will appeal to the popular motivation of the South, they would read something like this:

What is it that we now have?
What is it that we want?
What is the distance between what we have and what we want?
What will it take to bridge this distance?
How can we get what it takes to bridge the distance?
What is the best way to go about getting what it takes?

Now we come again to emphasize the fact that our statement of what the South needs to be at its best is not something very specific in the field of education or industry or labor or capital, but it is the development of all of its people and capacities. We may, therefore, examine a simple framework upon which to project our questions and answers.

The Southern regions of the United States are a component part of a great nation, whose development and welfare depend upon the corresponding development and welfare of all of its regions adequately integrated and co-

ordinated. For the purpose of this little discussion, we assume that there are five major types of wealth and resources which go into the making of a rich civilization. These are natural wealth and resources; technological wealth—science, skill, organization, and management; capital wealth—invested capital and means for the development of resources; human wealth—the people, symbol and reality of all wealth; institutional wealth—means for developing human wealth.

Now, our studies have shown that the South excels in two of these types of wealth, but lags in three. That is, it has a super-abundance of natural wealth and of human wealth, having a great range and variety of climate and resources, on the one hand, and being the seed bed of population, on the other. It lags, however, in technological wealth—skill, science, and management; and because of this, therefore, it is short in capital wealth and is, therefore, poor; and because of this it is not able to support its institutions for the development of its people as it would desire to do. In addition to these technical limitations, there has been a large measure of waste in both natural resources and human resources, so that it has been customary to think of the South in terms of a certain mode of low economic and living standards and of a relatively large number of marginal folk living on eroded land without resources enough to reach the American standard of living. The most common illustrations of this have been in recent years in terms of farm tenancy, of certain limited opportunities of the Negroes, and of the dilemma of the cotton and tobacco money-crop economy. In general, this is the basis for characterizing the South as the nation's number one problem.

Now we have answered our question as to what we now have in the South. We shall now look at the answer to the next question as to what we want. You will see the extraordinary importance of education here from our next assumption; namely, that if the South can provide education, skill, science, and management, through which it can translate its natural wealth into capital wealth and income adequate to support its institutions, forthwith the South would excel in all five of these great resources, and would, therefore, constitute the South at its best. That is, if we can translate our natural resources into capital wealth, I have the feeling that the South is sufficiently highly motivated to devote a great portion of this wealth to our institutions, which in turn would develop and enrich the people, conserve their interest, and contribute to that American democracy which makes wealth and weal synonymous. This is the South that we want.

From the viewpoint of the schools and those who support the schools, there are three immediate tasks which, if accomplished, together with the other planning and rapid progress that is being made, would justify the enthusiastic statement of many Southerners that the South is the Nation's *opportunity number one*. First is the problem of educating the new generation of the South to sense the meaning of natural wealth and its relation to the

living realities of the people and their welfare; this includes a sensing of the value of work and high standards of achievement. Second, is the problem of widening the range of occupational opportunity, through new developments, to the end that the superabundance of Southern youth may have a chance to work, and thus to develop and use our resources. The third task is, then, actually to train and equip these youth so that they may function adequately and in competition with workers everywhere.

Manifestly, more capital wealth is necessary for the undertaking of these tasks. This wealth must come from several sources: from the South's own economic gains in line with the extraordinary progress that has been made in the last few years; from the investment of wealth owned by Southerners who are joining in the new frontiers of Southern development; from investments of those who live outside the region, but who see in it an opportunity for regional and national development; from national foundations whose monies in research and experimentation can give leverage to regional support; and from the Federal Government in equalization program—agriculture, roads, health, education, public safety, and the like.

It must be clear that although some of these tasks belong to the institutions of higher learning, to technical schools, to industrial research, to farm chemurgic, to lawyers and business men, it is essentially a problem of public education to be achieved through the increasingly dynamic and realistic school system, for it is evident that our youth at the present time do not have a sense of the real meaning of natural wealth, of standards of work, of achievement. It has not been fashionable either for boys or girls to be interested in soil erosion, natural resources, conservation, waste of men, and waste of soil, or in social problems. One of the most pathetic spectacles of our whole situation is that of the most attractice youth in the world literally hanging around drug stores and way places, wondering what it is all about and what to do next.

With reference to the widening range of occupational opportunity, it must be clear now that scarcely more than half of our Southern youth can hope to have equal opportunity in the old sense of the American dream—opportunity to work, to create, to have families, and to find security. There must be new avenues through increasing industry and the balance between industry and agriculture and increased opportunity for trained leaders. We must work out the answers to some such question as this: how many and what sort of new and old industries will give occupations to how many people from the farms and villages, who in turn will create purchasing power to enable how many more people to remain on the farm to produce commodities of that sort, in turn to help support industries which make for a balanced economy?

It must be clear also with reference to the third need that at the present time our Southern youth are not trained to do anything very well. In an

age of scarcity and need for work, for engineering, for skills, for farming, for dairying, it is not possible to find personnel equipped to do the jobs that must be done and in reality jobs that the youth themselves would want to do if they knew about them and were so equipped.

Public education has been one of the pillars of the faith and the hope of American democracy. In this new sense it must become increasingly the key to the development of new American frontiers. When, therefore, we say that it is incumbent upon us all to devote the next ten years as a measuring space to achieve the South at its best, we must begin with public education and with youth, and with that great body of teachers who must be educated to sense this new power and realism of education. Education, then, in the secondary schools in the immediate future must be synonymous with this ideal of the South at its best in a nation which finds strength in the diversity and richness of its regions.

This South at its best being a young South, a growing South, less impeded by technological determinism than other regions, may also seek in its education that balance and equilibrium between culture and civilization, which must undoubtedly mark the survival of any democratic nation in the modern world. This cultural education must somehow recreate and reincarnate the natural folk society of the people in harmony with nature and resources. The South at its best as wrought out through the educational program, must have harmony and balance between the genuine, realistic culture of the people and the mechanical civilization of urbanism and technology, which will insure an enduring society. This is not to talk about what is right and what is wrong, what is best and what is worst, but it is to point out a scientific margin of survival for a superior mankind and adequate society.

As symbolic of some of the differences between culture and civilization as they are reflected in the appraisal of the past, the present, and future prospects, we may present sampling of those contrasts which will challenge education in the future.

For instance, culture is the folk society, and civilization is the state society.

Culture is democratic, while civilization is autocratic and totalitarian.

Culture means growth and development; civilization means merely progress and decline.

Culture connotes survival; civilization, achievement.

Culture is evolutionary and slow moving, while civilization is revolutionary and highly accelerated.

Culture is human, striving, personal, and individual; civilization is the machine, the mass, and the class.

Culture is natural and realistic; civilization is artificial and utopian.

Culture is ethnic and societal, while civilization is civil and technological.

Culture is adolescent and growing; civilization is mature and senescent.

Culture is moral-purposive, while civilization is scientific-technical.

Culture seeks the best quality and value, while civilization achieves the maximum, the quantity, money and power.

But in all this search for societal culture, we must keep in mind that we mean the total cumulative heritage of the people in the larger societal, anthropological sense, and not the superficial, artificial form and technology, whether it be of the machine, of utopia, of intelligentsia, or of art. For it is a social axiom that whenever the demands of artificial society, of super-technology, of super-specialism exceed the capacity of the people to adapt and whenever the means, whether as institutions or as machines, come to take on the civilized nature of ends in themselves, where ends justify the means, then society begins to deteriorate, and unless living culture is recreated through a new and dynamic and realistic education, sooner or later there is disorganization and decay.

# Culture in American Democracy*

By John Temple Graves, II
*Editor, Birmingham Age-Herald, Birmingham, Alabama*

I greet you as manufacturers of that excellence in human being without which our country cannot survive the stresses of this day. The culture of which you have told me to speak is something of which you could far better speak to me. I shall not attempt to tell you anything at all about it, but merely to discuss it here in your presence and subject to your correction. In America today we are having to discover again the meaning of this nation out of all its multiplicities, the unity in all its variety. We are having to learn again what we have been teaching our children and ourselves, forgetting that this is indeed a land of the free and a home of the brave, and that the science and machine which have made our culture possible are not identical always with it. Every unhappy word from over the Atlantic tells us now of a gap between men and the machines of men, between science and the civilization that science is supposed to make. Every mortal instrument is being used over there to bring back the Dark Ages. The betrayal, robbery, persecution, mutilation of whole peoples, the refusals of all authority but that of armed might, the denials of religion, honor, art, the plighted word, the dignity and privacy of individuals—all these are being done to the tune of the very latest in science, the most modern in machinery.

Our task is to capitalize upon the blessed Atlantic. It is to use the great opportunity to prove and hold our culture—by understanding it, loving it, believing it can survive. We need to hold America now not against armies or navies from over sea, but against the awful advertising that is given the totalitarian philosophies by their temporary successes and our own often failures. We have to persuade some of our most successful Americans not to turn fascist in fear of communism, and some of our most humane and free-minded Americans not to turn communist in hate of fascism. We have to convince them that democracy is not a failure, that it works, that it can be made to work better than it does, and that its four great bases still are the rule of majorities, the right of minorities, the dignity of individuals, and the inviolability of property. We need to match the totalitarians with disciplines and devotions of our own, devotions that belong to no regiment, disciplines that go without goose-step. In a day when patriotism is so properly the fashion, we need to be on guard against the politicians of patriotism, the profiteers, the knaves, and, worst of all, the lunatics of patriotism, against those who invite us to join organizations with patriotic names and unpatriotic purposes, against those who ask us to do ignoble things in a noble name,

* An address delivered before the banquet meeting of the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, April 11, 1940, Atlanta, Georgia.

against those who would persuade us that the way to save America is to destroy America by destroying its Bill of Rights.

We have the task, too, of preserving and making productive as it has not yet been the competitive economic system which is the basis of both our democracy and our capitalism—for we believe in both, I take it. Dr. Glenn Frank, that great educator who has gone lately into the wilderness in search of a philosophy for the Republican Party declares in the one he professes to have found that the nation's economic system "has been under the oxygen tent of government spending and made-work for seven years." If Dr. Frank had been more the doctor and less the Republican in this statement, however, he would have put the number of years under the tent at twenty, not seven. Ever since the World War this country has been going in for artificial respiration, shots in the arm, local and general anaesthetics. There was no more health in the twenties than there was in the thirties—and we of the forties need to remember it. The sickness was of the same species, too, and the remedies were much the same. If the thirties had to be supported artificially with public subsidies, the twenties were supported as artificially with private ones. If we gave away money to Americans in the thirties with which to buy American goods, we gave the money to foreigners in the twenties. If we paid our way with public debt in the thirties, we paid it in the twenties with all manner of private debt, individual and corporate, bonded and installment. The only difference Dr. Frank may really claim is that we all enjoyed our ill health more in the twenties. The jazz age was gay, at any rate. But in offset to that it might be said that the jazz age was also the ugliest ever invented and that even if we didn't have as good a time in the thirties we were more graceful about it and produced much more civilized clothes, music, literature, morals, young people and little children. No, the comparisons are odious in either direction, and the hope of the forties is that our doctors will be truly doctors, not just Democrats or Republicans, New Dealers or anti-New Dealers, that they will make common consultation over an economic system which still fails to click in spite of all the business restraints of the thirties and the business freedoms of the twenties.

For proving and holding America, for recognizing its culture and the bases of that culture enough to retain them, we need not half so much the products of our arsenals and airplane plants as we do the product of your factories, gentlemen—the excellence in human being which comes of general education. When you took for your theme this year the subject "Education's Responsibility to Democracy," you had in mind, I believe, neither vocational nor professional education (important though both of them are) but the education which truly nurtures and leads forth, the experiences which instruct not merely in making a living but in living—and letting live—and being a citizen, a patriot, a consumer, a sensitive, social-minded, characterful human being. You knew that without such an education Americans cannot hope

successfully to meet the two great facts of American life—democracy and machinery. You knew that without excellence in human being democracy won't work, that government by dumbbells is worse than government by dictators and leads at last to dictatorship in worst degree. You knew that without excellence in human beings our machine age won't run, that its consuming will not balance its producing, that its menaces will win over its blessings. You understood that it isn't enough in times like these merely to know how to shift the gears and turn the switches and oil the bearings of our machines, that we must know also where to go with the machines, how to shift social gears, turn economic switches, oil psychological bearings, and that without this our democracy will betray us and our machines will be agents of tyranny, poverty, and death.

Excellence in human being! In all human being! There is need of taking better care of our brightest men in college, yes, but not at the expense of the average. There is great need, especially in the South where the shortage is most acute, of training our high school students in the skilled trades and the dignity of those trades—but not at the expense of general education. We must train workers to work and leaders to lead, yes, but most of all we must train everybody to be a first class human being. The hope of an age of democracy and machinery depends not upon its tops but upon its averages. It depends upon mass education. It depends upon general education. There are too many specialists today who are not whole men. There are too many captains of industry who have not the education to make their industry contribute as it should to our culture, too many labor leaders who blindly lead the blind. There are too many lawyers who don't know economics and too many economists who have no proper respect for the law and its long process. There are too many politicians without the education to make statecraft of their success. There are too many engineers who forget that the greatest engine is the one the Lord God made in Eden. With everybody's work and dream related to everybody else's as never before in history, with what each one of us does affecting all the rest of us in unfathomed degree, the need is for whole men and women who know not only what they do but what is before and behind.

Excellence in human being! The excellence that is uplifted in spirit by knowledge, not made cynical and soft by what it knows. If this democracy's culture is to survive and grow, the spirit of man must remain stout. Stout with sense of value, with heart for adventure, with ability to hope and believe and love and know there are things in life worth dying for and things that do not die. "The German bombs have no more affect on us," cried Warsaw's mayor over that pitiful radio of his in the midst of the siege last September, "We are accustomed to them!" It was a whistle in the awful dark, a shout of unavailing defiance as death closed in. The supernatural refused to be summoned. Mind did not conquer matter nor the spirit of

Poland the iron and steel of Adolph Hitler. But in that spirit, in that cry of Warsaw's mayor, was the hope of the world and the secret of its success. The spirit of man may not yet conquer matter in hand-to-hand fighting—not even in Finland—but it goes on thinking that it can and shouting that it will. Defeated infinitely through infinite years it lives on, and in its living is the source of all we associate with culture and think of as God. It will survive the fall of Warsaw. It lives on in mutilated Finland. It will outlive all the murder and destruction yet to be. Guns can't shatter it or submarines sink it or dictators order it down. Take away a thousand years of its progress, and it begins again at the taking off place. Rob it of nine-tenths of its world, and it goes to work on the tenth that remains. And in the end it conquers simply because it does not die, because it can no more be destroyed than machine-guns can "wound the loud winds" or torpedoes "kill the still-closing waters."

# Education in the Higher Institutions of the South*

By Herbert E. Hawkes
*Dean, Columbia College, Columbia University*

In the course of the past fifty years a striking change in conditions regarding the problem of admission to the liberal arts college has taken place. A large part of this change is due to the phenomenal increase in college attendance, which reflects that for better or for worse boys and girls feel that the college experience is an essential preparation for and introduction to the kind of life that they wish to live. A part of the change is due to the development of the public supported colleges, for the most part in connection with state universities. Perhaps the most significant reason for the situation is due to the change in attitude toward the entire educational process which started a hundred years ago in the elementary schools, reached up into the secondary schools after a time, finally affected the liberal arts colleges, and now shows some feeble symptoms of being realized by the graduate and professional schools.

In most colleges of fifty years ago the course of study was little more than a continuation of the subject matter of the schools on a slightly higher level. In many colleges the most striking difference between the school and the college work was longer lessons expressed in terms of longer words. Many a boy entering college then, and I fear sometimes now, felt that there was too much of threshing over the same old stuff in the same old way.

Going to college, then as now, involved one of the most stirring emotional experiences that the student has ever known. New surroundings, new friends, new responsibilities, new freedom all strike the youngster at once. If the college provides nothing intellectual comparable with these emotional experiences, it must be a terrible let-down, often amounting to a disillusion. The effect of this let-down may or may not be recognized by the student. But I am certain that it frequently has a serious effect on his attitude toward college work. The momentum of the emotional uplift may last through the first year, but to my way of thinking its gradual loss accounts in large measure for the well-known sophomore slump.

In the nineties, when the studies which the freshman took were a continuation of the secondary school work, just a little more of the Greek, the Latin, and the mathematics of the schools, it was obviously necessary to provide very specific tests at entrance in order to determine whether the youth was ready to continue these topics. Hence, rigid sets of entrance examinations told the whole story so far as admission was concerned. I took twenty-three examinations for admission to college, and passed all of them, except

* An address delivered before a joint meeting of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education and the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940.

that in elementary algebra, which was my favorite study. I must say that perhaps that experience shook my confidence in the divine inspiration of entrance examinations to an extent from which it has never quite recovered.

With increasing seriousness colleges have been attempting to make the freshman year an intellectual awakening as well as an emotional one. No longer do most of them simply add an additional year of high school work. We try to introduce the youth to a world of ideas as well as information in various areas of intellectual activity. Some of this body of ideas and information necessarily implies continuity with earlier work, as, for example, mathematics and the foreign languages. No such precise degree of continuity, however, is necessary in the social studies or the humanities. Although the term is not fully standardized, I assume that the humanities include literature approached chiefly through the English language, the various arts, philosophy, and the like.

If this is true, the candidate for admission to college needs not so much specific examinations in every subject of preparatory school curriculum, as some evaluation of his quality, as an intellectual and social being.

A few weeks ago I called a conference of all the instructors of freshmen in Columbia College in order to talk about this important topic. In the course of the conference I asked them what kind of students they really wanted in their courses, what kind of intellectual background, what pattern of preparation, what areas of competency. The replies were interesting. They reported with one accord that they wanted boys who could read with good speed and comprehension, and who knew how to guage their reading to the various types of material that they were called upon to master. They wanted boys who had a reasonable facility in self-expression both orally and in writing. So much for English. Then they wanted boys who knew how to tackle a hard intellectual job and carry it through to completion, boys who had acquired the habit and zest for work. You may call this discipline. Furthermore, they wanted boys who knew an idea when they saw one, who were accustomed to dealing with ideas—in short, who had reasonable intellectual maturity. These three points were mentioned again and again in one form or another. The amazing fact was that very little was said about the specific pattern of subject-matter preparation. If the students had gained these fundamental qualities and attitudes, these instructors did not care where they got them. In fact many of the instructors in the various freshman courses in social studies, in humanities, and even in science said that they could not tell from the way in which a boy took hold of his college work whether he had passed this or that entrance examination except in so far as it was reflected in these qualities. To be sure, in the humanities it appeared that the boy who had good grounding in Latin had a head start in the reading of the Greek and Roman classics that are included in this course. But in this course, those who had received such training could not

be distinguished after a few weeks from those who had not, provided both groups knew how to work. The corresponding fact held true in the sciences.

The question then comes to the foreground: how are we going to detect and evaluate those qualities independently of the specific medium through which they have been developed? Shall we try to determine them directly or through the conventional examination method? It is obvious that it is impossible to know whether a boy has the capacity to do a demanding job if he has never done one. Hence evidence must be gathered on this point. Furthermore, it would certainly be letting down the morale of the schools not to emphasize the necessity of doing the specific work of the school with distinction.

I cannot give all of the answers to the questions that I have asked. But I am certain that you will agree that they are worth considering. I am also certain that many of us are working on them in one way and another.

This whole topic is intimately related to the necessity for a rigid pattern of subject matter in preparation for college. For some years colleges have viewed with interest, but in many instances without conviction, the efforts of those schools that have been experimenting with the intensely complex problem of providing a less rigid secondary pattern of schooling. We have called them "progressive schools" for the lack of a more descriptive name. I will not take time to attempt to outline the philosophy on which they rest, from which they make their point of departure, or describe their many attempts to apply that philosophy to their job of school teaching. You may supply the details. Suffice it to say that there is no one pattern, and no standardized approach. But it has been and is an exceedingly important movement, and we are now for the first time in a position to state with some definiteness certain results.

Some seven years ago the Commission of the Progressive Education Association on School and College Relation was organized under a subvention from the Central Education Board. One of the most important questions on which this Commission, which is usually referred to as the Eight Year Study, wished to obtain reliable evidence was that of the relation between the pattern of the preparatory school program and college success. Thirty schools of various types were selected for participation in the Study, some of them known as very progressive, others as relatively conservative. Liberal arts colleges from every part of the country were almost unanimous in expressing their willingness to admit from these schools during the eight-year period of the study students who seemed competent to carry the work of the college successfully, without reference to specific requirements for admission.

Seven of the eight years have passed, and many of the students who entered the thirty schools when the Study started, have now completed three years of college work. Students in the following years have completed two years and one year respectively, of college residence. There is now available

a wealth of information as to the college success of these students who received their preparation in the thirty schools. This information has been gathered throughout the seven years by an evaluation committee, consisting of several full-time persons on the staff of the Commission who have investigated as carefully and as objectively as they could the preparation, the progress, and the comparative success of the students entering the various colleges from the thirty schools. Many predictions were ventured at the beginning of the Study, but only recently do we have a real ground for conviction.

At a recent meeting of the Commission, a committee was appointed to examine the evidence concerning the college success of the graduates of the thirty schools. The remarks that I am about to make have the approval of this committee, which consists of President Barrows of Lawrence College, Dean Brumbaugh of the University of Chicago, Doctor Gummere of Harvard University, President Park of Bryn Mawr, Dean Speight of Swarthmore, and myself. Doctor Gummere wishes to add the footnote that Harvard, as I daresay many other colleges, still regards entrance examinations as a partial but indispensable test for admission, except in very special cases. For several years Harvard has pursued the policy of admitting, with a minimum of written examination, boys from the highest seventh of their graduating classes from many schools not among the thirty. Doctor Gummere tells me that these students in the highest seventh, from schools not among the thirty, are as successful in college as those admitted from the thirty schools.

It should be stated that many of the thirty schools modified their curriculums radically after entering the Study. Others have made only slight changes. So far as I know, none of the colleges which these students have entered have modified their curricula or the requirements for their degrees for these students as a group. That is, we have light on the question as to whether the character of teaching and general experience in these schools, which most of us classify as progressive, fits or misfits students for college work.

About 3,300 students from the thirty schools entered college in September, 1936, 1937, and 1938. Of these students, 1,472 were enrolled in about thirty colleges in sufficiently large groups to justify a detailed following of their college residence. It should be mentioned that the graduates of the thirty schools score distinctly higher on aptitude or intelligence tests than the average entering student. So far as one can judge, their mean is in about the 65th percentile. It was therefore necessary, in determining the college success of these students, to set a control or comparison group in each college in which each student from the thirty schools is matched in terms of age, sex, race, aptitude, interests, size and type of home community, and family background as exactly as is humanly possible with another student similar in all of these respects, but from a school not among the thirty. It goes with-

out saying that such a comparison group does not furnish a perfect statistical control, but it is probably as nearly accurate as the usual measurement of college success in terms of instructor's grades.

The earliest basis for comparison appears when these students present themselves for placement tests in order to determine whether or not they ought to be promoted above or demoted below the point that their raw entrance records would indicate. Results on this point are only fragmentary and from only three liberal arts colleges in state universities. In these three institutions, forty-one graduates from the thirty schools were exempt from the usual freshman courses in English, Foreign Languages, History, or Chemistry, as against twenty-six in the comparison group. Six students from the thirty schools were required to repeat courses on the basis of the placements, while two of the comparison groups were required to do so. This result is not surprising, since graduates from the thirty schools might be expected to have concentrated more intensely during their preparatory school courses on the subjects of their greatest interests.

In order to obtain a comparison between the graduates of the thirty schools and their mates in the control group, members of the evaluation committee of the Eight Year Study have regularly visited the institution where any considerable number of the students were registered in order to become personally acquainted with them and with their controls just referred to, so that they might reach as well-considered opinions as possible regarding their adjustment to the work of the college and the measure of success that they attained, both in their studies and in their social relations. Comparisons in each of the major fields of study between the graduates of the thirty schools have been made with scrupulous care. I will not go into the statistical results at this time. It is sufficient to say that observation of the 1,972 students from the thirty schools, which were about evenly divided between the sexes, indicates very little difference in college grades between them and their controls. On the whole, the students from the thirty schools were slightly superior to the control group. Those who have been in college for three years excelled in the humanities, the social studies, and the physical sciences. The grades were almost exactly even in English and the biological sciences. They were distinctly inferior in the foreign languages, but distinctly superior in such subjects as fine arts, music and the like. I will not attempt to analyze the results for those who have only two years or one year of college experience, except to say that the students from the thirty schools who entered in 1938 and whose college records for only one year, are available, excel their controls from other schools in every field of study notably in English, humanities, physical sciences, and mathematics. This may reflect the careful job that the faculties of the thirty schools have done during the past three years in improving their curricula, and affording a more adequate intellectual training for their students.

One further observation is interesting, a report on the college success of the graduates of the six of the thirty schools whose programs differ most from the conventional pattern, that is what one would call the most progressive schools, as compared with that of their comparison groups. A complementary report has been made on the college success of the graduates of the six of the thirty schools which differ least from the conventional pattern as compared with their matched pairs. There were 361 students from the six most progressive schools, and 417 from the most conventional schools. It turns out that the students from the least conventional schools excelled their controls by a score that may roughly be expressed as 27 to 7, while the students from the most conventional schools of the thirty schools were excelled by their control group by a score that may roughly be expressed as 14 to 16. That is, as far as these data are significant, the students from the schools whose pattern of program differed most from the conventional were very distinctly superior to those from the more conventional type of school. It cannot be inferred that the methods of the least conventional schools account entirely for the superiority of the group that they send to college. There may be a selection at a lower level. It is possible that particularly thoughtful and adventurous parents choose these schools for their children, and that in the homes from which the pupils of these schools come there are stimulating influences toward wide reading, frank discussion, and a broad outlook.

I should add that in extracurricular interests non-athletic in character, the graduates of the thirty schools are markedly more alert than their comparison group.

The results of this study seem to indicate that the pattern of preparatory school program which concentrates on a preparation for a fixed set of entrance examinations is not the only satisfactory means of fitting a boy or girl for making the most out of the college experience. It looks as if the capacities and interests of the students are equally important with the pattern of subject matter studied, and apparently the stimulus and initiative which the less conventional approach to secondary school education affords sends on to college students as well, if not better, prepared for the college experience than comparable students who have had the more traditional preparation.

# Evolutionary Force of Education in Democracy*

By Rufus C. Harris
*President, Tulane University*

Education, like development, is response to stimuli. The chief task of the teacher, under this conception, is to stimulate the pupil and by the choice of appropriate stimuli seek to bring forth the desired response. It is a duty of the teacher to stimulate students to acquire good habits and to avoid bad ones.

How much the world needs these good habits, how much it suffers from the bad ones is illustrated on every hand. The present crisis in the world is largely caused by the deliberate training of people in had habits of fear, hate, intolerance, aggression, greed, and war. It is not due to bad heredity, nor to inexorable nature, but to bad education. Peace and progress of mankind thus depend upon acquiring the habits that make for peace and progress.

The bearing of all this upon the evolution of education for our democratic society is not difficult to see. Democracy emphasizes the rights of freedom, and importance of the common man, in the organization of society. In a democracy it involves the development of contingent ideals gradually groping toward ever-shifting goals. It cannot be as clear-cut as in states where the political and economic philosophies are crystallized or kept in a fixed state by the system of dictatorship. It must of necessity reflect the vague, even blind, gropings of the people as they reach out for new horizons which unfold before them.

I have been attempting for some time to formulate the educational philosophy which shaped our contemporary thinking about education. It had its beginnings in the social speculations of the British and French imperialists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Their thinking embodied a definite break with theological traditions. It was essentially individualistic and hedonistic, embodying a search for happiness—happiness of quite tangible and sensible character. Its faith was the perfectability of the natural man, its social goal the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Social control, government, and law embodied a series of contracts among individuals whereby the largest possible measure of happiness and of the rich and abundant life might be made available to every citizen. Enlightenment was the instrument through which this goal was to be attained, and enlightened self-interest was largely the basis of value.

This philosophy functioned admirably during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Exploration was pushed forward, colonies were founded, immense new sources of wealth were uncovered, the development of physical sciences seemed to promise unlimited vistas of material development and

* An address delivered over radio station WGST, Atlanta, Georgia, April 10, 1940, in connection with the Forty-fourth Annual Meeting of the Southern Association.

progress. Land, wealth, and social status were freely available to anyone with the necessary qualifications of energy, courage, and intelligence.

Educationally, this philosophy of human perfectability found its most eloquent expression in Rousseau. If children developed naturally, uninhibited, and untrammeled by the artificial restrictions of theology and politics, and disciplined only by the exigencies of their own experience, their innate perfectability would be bound to express itself. The result would be a new type of free and happy human being and ultimately, a social order guaranteeing the largest possible measure of freedom and happiness to all. This concept thoroughly dominated and conditioned America's thinking about education for the past century. It engendered noble and impassioned dreams of a new civilization which seemed immediately realizable.

It is difficult for us today to face the possibility that realizations of this dream may have to be postponed, because the realities of the twentieth century are dark and forbidding. The democratic concept of a social order embodying a free and enlightened and tolerant citizenry is being challenged and on the surface successfully challenged. The question of whether an easy-going democracy can compete successfully with a close-knit totalitarian state in either economic or military realms will be answered by the events of the next half century. The issue is upon us, whether we like it or not. Even within our democratic order, desperate competition for economic privileges among compact and well organized pressure groups is giving rise to hatreds and suspicions which may presage the break-down of democratic tradition.

Such internally generated friction is apparently being intensified by a most curious and hitherto unsuspected phenomena of a biological nature. The extension of public hygiene and preventive medicine has definitely and dramatically extended the life span of the average citizen. On the other hand, from some causes still largely obscure, the birth rate has for several decades been steadily falling. We seem headed for a state of affairs in which the majority of our adult population will be made up of elderly unemployed citizens. There is evidence that our senior citizens are becoming conscious of the fact that they enjoy a tremendous voting power which is steadily increasing. A program of increasingly liberal old-age pensions is plainly just ahead. With a corresponding increase of political consciousness it is not wholly fantastic to vision the emergence of a new leisure class holding the reins of political power and exploiting the productive capacity of youth.

If this comes to pass, it is hardly likely that the opportunity of utilizing education to fortify the new order will be overlooked and education will become less and less child-centered. Should the young revolt they would not have the votes to change the situation by parliamentary means. It is improbable that the framework of democracy could stand the resulting strain. To attain success the revolt of youth would have to express itself through some form of militant fascism. Such a movement, if successful,

would also be certain to make use of the schools as agencies of indoctrination. However we may view the educational situation, it becomes increasingly evident that contemporary theory and practice must meet the challenge of new and powerful though ill-defined forces.

Two assumptions in particular demand the most penetrating and dispassionate thought. Is the concept of individual happiness a tenable ultimate goal or objective? Does the concept of a social order based upon equal participation in government by all citizens, regardless of environment or education, embody a workable social ideal? These are the assumptions which the totalitarian states are challenging. These are the issues out of which will develop whatever the future may hold. Certainly in a world of war, hatred, poverty, and injustice, disciplined contempt for the softness inherent in any manifestation of sensory gratification for its own sake, however beautifully and delicately the latter may be expressed, embodies a sterner and nobler quality than even the most enlightened self-interest. Much as we may regret it, the facts seem to indicate that we are going to live in that kind of world for at least the next generation or two. If we are to survive, it would seem that education must be cast in such fashion as to promote a much tougher, sterner, and more disciplined type of character than is at present apparent among our young people.

It is hardly likely that our present tolerance of civic chicanery, prejudiced minority pressures, and unenlightened mass action can long endure. If we cannot order our public affairs economically and intelligently we will be pushed aside by states which can. We must devise ways and means of shifting the business of actual government from the relatively cumbersome and unconsidered action of our masses to direction by intelligent and honest men who have been professionally trained for that function. To bring this about without irreparably weakening the foundations of democracy demands far-reaching educational program, based upon a more coherent educational philosophy than has yet been formulated.

It is plainly then the role of education to select and train citizens competent to cope with the times which are upon us. It is even more the task of organized education to create and nourish public opinion which will think of government as a highly specialized, professional function, and which will elect to office men and women who measure up to high standards of efficiency and integrity. Educators must fully realize that the present time is not time for complacency and that much of the easy-going experimentation of the past is already out of date.

The problem of ways and means of achieving these ends is not by any means simple. The first of these tasks seems in the main a function of universities and other institutions of higher learning. While they have already

rendered notable service in this field, they frequently fail conspicuously to develop among gifted students an adequate sense of social obligation.

Higher education must embody in its programs far more emphasis upon rigorous social analysis and disciplined social consciousness. We know the dependence of the university upon sympathetic public opinion. If it is to achieve its purpose that public opinion must be not only sympathetic but also enlightened and dynamic. The university here may be conceived as a powerhouse, whose high potential is useless unless stepped down by transforming stations to the capacity of the motors which actually drive our machinery. Developing this analogy, our public elementary and secondary schools may be regarded as the agencies through which the highest intellectual potential of our universities is transformed into effective thinking and action on the part of our citizens.

The educational program must, I think, be built around the humanities and social studies as a core. With children we must begin with activities and interests which are already engrossing. With a little guidance they come to see life in terms of its basic processes. Out of such activities come more complex and specialized interests—the evolution of agriculture, industry, machinery, transportation, communication, government. If these studies are to function, the students must see them as processes in evolution; he must sense the part that invention and speculation have played in the modification of culture. The real history of man is the history of his institutions; no other sort of history has any place in elementary education. The student must be helped to a vivid realization of the destructive and retarding effects of war, intolerance, prejudice, and bigotry upon man's search for a better way of life. He must come to see how the beliefs from which such evils spring melt and disintegrate when the method of science is focused upon them. With increasing maturity, the significance of the scientific way of thinking must be stressed.

What we need is an appreciation of how science goes to work and what it has accomplished. We can introduce children to the priesthood of science long before they are capable of participating in its rites. Throughout this study of the evolving human adventure there must be no disposition to flinch from the grim fact that human welfare has been wrought out with tears and blood and that happiness in any shallow sense has been a minor concern with the prophets and pioneers of progress. We must stress human worth in terms of courage, clear thinking and social concern.

The evolution of education for our democratic society seems likely to involve more discipline and purposes than that of the immediate past. Much that is lovely, much pleasant and purposeless play, much research unrelated to human welfare probably will have to be postponed or minimized for a

generation or two. Educators and their students must be prepared to play courageous and disciplined roles. Education in the ideals and habits of democracy; education for freedom and responsibility; education for order and social welfare; education for eugenics and euthenics; education for ethics and character—these are the things for which education in our democratic society must strive.

# Editorial Notes

## Forty-fifth Annual Meeting, December 9-13, 1940
## Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tennessee

Secretary Shelton Phelps makes the following announcement of the 1940-41 meeting of the Association in a letter to the Quarterly:

> The Forty-fifth Annual Meeting will be held at Memphis, Tennessee, beginning on December 9 and ending on December 13. All meetings will be held in the Peabody Hotel, and all offices will be located there. The prices for rooms at the Peabody will be as follows: room for one person, $3.00 per day; room for two persons, double bed, $2.00 per day per person; room for two persons, twin beds, $3.00 per day per person. The following rates are obtainable at the Gayoso Hotel: single rooms with bath, $2.00 to $2.50 per day; double rooms with bath, $3.00 to $3.50 per day; double room with twin beds and bath, $3.50 to $4.00 per day; single rooms without bath, $1.50 per day; double rooms without bath, $2.50 per day. The Hotel Tennessee lists 50 single rooms at $2.00 per day and 50 double rooms at $3.50 per day. Hotel Claridge has listed 200 rooms at the following rates: single rooms, $2.50 to $5.00 per day; double rooms, $3.50 to $6.00 per day; double rooms with twin beds, $4.50 to $7.50 per day. The Hotel DeVoy has listed 50 rooms at: single rooms, $1.75, $2.00, to $3.00 per day; double rooms, $2.50, $3.00, to $4.00 per day; double rooms with twin beds, $3.50 to $4.00 per day. 150 rooms at the Hotel Chisca are available at $1.50, $2.00, and $2.50 per day for single rooms; $2.00, $3.00, and $3.50 per day for double rooms; and $3.50 and $4.00 per day for rooms with twin beds.

Reservations should be made in advance and are being received by the hotels now. If any members of the Association wish to go to Memphis one or two days before December 9, they should make reservations also for the extra days. Of course the rates apply to the wives or guests of members of the Association who attend the meeting with them, and to guests of the Association invited to the meeting.

## Unifying Education for National and Individual Security: An Open Forum for All Interested Members

The theme for the annual meeting to be held December 9-13 in Memphis, Tennessee has not yet been announced by President Hinson and the Executive Committee. One theme that has been proposed is, "Unifying education for national and individual security." This theme appeals to the QUARTERLY as one that will interest many members of the Association as a good topic for the open forum which it has become the custom of the QUAR-

TERLY to hold prior to the annual meeting. Discussion is invited from any interested person connected with the Southern Association. Contributions should be limited to perhaps a thousand words; but unless so many members respond as to compel the editor to conserve space, longer contributions will be considered. Short contributions, even to the extent of very brief answers to the questions suggested below, will also be welcome. The questions suggested are not intended to limit the discussion but to stimulate the thinking of those interested. The following are the questions suggested:

1. (a) If compulsory military service becomes a fairly permanent part of our national policy, how can this policy be fitted into the educational system of the nation? (b) What is your opinion as to whether compulsory military service should become a permanent policy?

2. (a) Is it desirable that the CCC and NYA, either or both, become a permanent part of the educational program? (b) If they are to become a permanent part of the educational program, how can they best serve the purposes of education?

3. (a) How may the school and other educational agencies coöperate in taking care of the "slack" in the time of the young citizen caused by the fact that the average young person under present conditions is unemployed for from six months to two years after he leaves school? (b) Is it possible so to coördinate the agencies for vocational training and job-placement that vocational education will be *for an available job?*

4. How can vocational education that functions as a program of training for jobs that actually exist be achieved? (It is urged with considerable force that vocational education, as we now know it, too often means in the high school merely new elective units that enable the student to avoid studying history or mathematics or some other unit he wishes to avoid—vocational units that regardless of their merits may be passed with a "D" or a "70" or whatever the lowest allowable grade is, without either (1) actually training the student for *any* job, or (2) training him for a job that can be had. It is frequently found also that once a school has installed equipment costing five or ten thousand dollars to train printers or some other special type of employee and has then employed a vocational teacher, usually at a higher salary than other teachers of similar training and experience, the school may train in two or three years all the young printers needed in its area for several years; but regardless of lack of jobs, the investment in equipment and personnel is too heavy to permit the school to discontinue this particular work.)

5. Are there certain subjects such as the fundamental knowledges and skills of home economics and industrial arts (specifically, the use of ordinary tools and the manipulation of common materials) that should be taught to all students, or all girls, or all boys, as a part of general education, without compelling schools to organize such courses into "units," and substitute them for other subjects?

6. Is there any way by which federal aid to education instead of directly subsidizing schools now provided by the states and local communities could be used to supplement and coördinate the various educational agencies with the idea of providing practical vocational education and practical placement of young people in jobs?

The QUARTERLY asks these questions without at all pretending to know the answers. If, however, it has stated them with sufficient force to encourage its readers to give partial answers, a good forum should be assured.

## Education's Responsibility to Democracy: II*

*(Continued from the issue for February, 1940)*

Capitalism and religion are but two of the institutions Democracy has found good that have not been adequately presented by recent education. This inadequacy extends to much, if not most, of what we call the *status quo*. I have pointed out that only in a democracy does education undertake to train citizens to be critical of the theories underlying the prevailing system. One vital difference between Mr. Roosevelt's New Deal in America and Herr Hitler's National Socialism, or Comrade Stalin's Bolshevism, lies in the fact that even the children in American schools have the right to question the actions of the government. In all soberness we feel that although they should be taught respect for Mr. Roosevelt's office and for the democratic processes that have for a time made him our national leader, they should know that they do not have to whisper when they speak words of criticism and do not imperil their parents' lives when they repeat words of criticism overheard at home. Any child in the civics or history classes of any high school in America can honestly ask the question and, I hope, receive a patient answer as to whether democracy really is better than dictatorship or some other system; but when we have said what I have said in the last few sentences, it is well to awaken with a start to realize that the very smugness with which I can say and you can hear this claim of superiority of our democratic institutions conceals a danger that we are just beginning to see. We have so stressed freedom of thinking and criticism that we have sometimes overlooked the fundamental nature and purpose of education and incidentally the nature of civilization. Human civilization exists because human beings have learned how to accumulate their wisdom and knowledge. Painfully man learned to write and through his writings he preserved his wisdom for his children and for countless generations. Slowly he began to understand numbers, and through numbers he learned how to preserve his quantitative knowledge of nature so that his children might start with what he

* This editorial and most of the corresponding editorial in the February issue were delivered as an address in the centennial program of Southwestern University, Georgetown, Texas, April 13, 1940.—EDITOR.

knew and add their contributions generation by generation. Civilization has aptly been compared to the coral polyps building, individual upon individual, on the remains of those gone before until bits of dry land appear in the vast expanse of water. Civilization, in short, depends absolutely upon man's ability to preserve what he knows and thinks and fears, so that other men may start where he leaves off. If this is civilization, then education in the last analysis involves introducing the child to what has been learned before his day, in order that he may use it and using it may add somewhat to the social store. Somewhere along the line American teachers began to be afraid lest the great debt of the individual to the past and the eagerness of the teachers to impress this debt upon the child might so crush his spirit that he could not contribute his increment to the social heritage.

For more than a generation those of us who are teachers have stressed the desirability of independent thinking and free exercise of judgment on the part of the child. We have taken pride in teaching him about such alien theories as anarchy, socialism, communism, and fascism. We have encouraged him to ask questions. We have insisted that he find his own answers, but we have made one serious blunder. We have assumed that we did not need to hold out to him the *status quo* as at least *one* plausible answer. We have been so anxious to point out the theories of socialism and the rest that we have not taken the trouble to let him even consider the justifications of capitalism. We have so emphasized his right to think for himself in religious matters that we have not taken the trouble to suggest that there is really a strong rational justification for religion. In our psychologies we have often explained at great length the philosophies of behaviorism and Freud, or whatever happened to be the current fad, without at all taking the trouble to explain the theories that some of the greatest thinkers of the race have pondered and repondered and found good. If we mention these theories at all, we refer to them as the "old philosophical psychologies"—as if being old, which may mean having been tried by many minds in many times, were in itself a condemnation, and being philosophical were fatal. Incidentally, what more dogmatic philosophy can be stated than that of extreme behaviorism when it states that there is no mind except what can be measured *by its measures?*

There is too often assumed to be a conflict between education for conformity and education as a development of original thinking, in spite of the fact that the story of civilization is the story of man's mastery, through temporary conformity, of what his predecessors have learned, in order that on that basis he may do original thinking. There is also common and vigorous assumption that development of original—in the sense of *different*, unsuggested —thinking means progress. The gangster does his very effective original thinking, but any progress resulting from it is his own and not society's. In

fact, we might well agree that the stupid individualism of the gangster arises from the fact that he does not know what conformity means.

Our morbid fear lest conformity may stifle "original" thinking, instead of really furnishing the foundation for original thinking that leads to progress, arises, I think, in part from the fact that democratic education has ignored as too commonplace to be taught the things that really matter. We teach the little child to use the ordinary physical trappings of civilization. He soon learns to wish to dress as other people. He learns the uses of chairs and tables and beds and houses, and learning them does not prevent his suggesting and thinking of improvement. He goes to school, and we carefully teach him to read, using the ordinary alphabet, in spite of the fact that it is not altogether satisfactory or logical. For example, there is really no use for the letter "c." Sometimes, as in "cat," it is pronounced like "k," and at other times, as in "city," it is pronounced like "s." It serves no independent function in pronunciation. On the other hand, the letter "a" is greatly overworked and has seven different pronunciations. Any linguistic scholar could probably produce a much better alphabet than the people of western Europe have ever used. But since it took mankind hundreds of years to develop this alphabet, we do not encourage each child to work out one for himself. We let him take the alphabet as he finds it, and he proceeds to use it. Similarly, we teach him the numbers, using the Arabic notation, and now and then a bit of Roman numerals, which ought to have been out of date a thousand years ago. We also insist that he learn the addition and multiplication tables as they are, and we encourage him to no individuality with reference to the facts of number combinations. He must take them as they are handed to him. Similarly with most of the elementary more or less mechanical things of civilization. All our efforts are toward conformity.

But when we come to the things that make our civilization great, to the thoughts of Jesus and Socrates and the other choice spirits, who have created the ethical standards that make civilization worth while, we cannot speak for fear that we "indoctrinate." No one proposes that we shall compel agreement. We do not contemplate such compulsion. But we are afraid even to explain what those teachings are, as if the act of explaining them would be indoctrination.

We have carried this attitude over to our political science and history courses. There was a time when it was permissible to point out that Magna Carta, with certain subsequent enlargements, and the Declaration of Independence summarized the rights of Englishmen and Americans. It was taken for granted that the Englishmen who enjoyed the rights granted by Magna Carta in 1215 were naturally the Englishmen who had full rights of citizenship; that is, the barons and their immediate feudal group. It was easy to understand that as other groups of citizens in the population gained

increasingly effective rights, they profited by the enumerations of the Great Charter. It was equally easy to understand that outstanding leaders of the American Revolution, such as George Washington and John Hancock who were men of property, had much to lose if the Revolution were lost. We thought as children in the public schools, that as rich and influential men who would have been singled out for punishment if the British won, they deserved additional credit because they risked both lives and property in assuming the stand they did. Some more recent historians, however, have pointed out that the English Magna Carta was all the result of a petty struggle between the king and his nobility, and the American Revolution was only the expression by the propertied classes in America that they proposed to rule on this side of the Atlantic instead of being ruled from London.

Personally I think it is one of education's responsibilities to democracy to teach the children of democracy its history and traditions, to prepare them for participation in the religious emotions and the political history that undergird our democracy, as well as teaching them conformity in spelling, reading, and how to hold a fork at the dinner table. No wonder so many of our younger children are bewildered and confused when they have had every question forced upon them in their education and every theory presented, *except* the theories underlying the things we hold most dear.

Some one has well said that an honest prejudice represents the sum total to date of our experiences and thinking upon the problems involved. Traditions are the prejudices of society. It might be well now and then to remember that the favorite remark so often heard, "There is nothing sacred in the *status quo*," is a pretty broad generalization. There is a great deal sacred in the *status quo* to those who regard anything as sacred—for example, civil and religious liberty, not to mention a host of other principles achieved in sacrifice, and blood, and suffering. The *status quo* represents the sum total of the experience of our race to date. It represents a working compromise, including as much idealism and as much altruism as we have so far been able to make work. It represents the point we have reached thus far, and we must understand it to modify it wisely.

Education has, further, a responsibility to democracy of pointing out the limitations of a majority vote. A majority vote is effective in indicating how many people prefer a certain line of conduct as compared to some alternative. Like a questionnaire, it merely shows the weight of opinion. It decides nothing as to fundamental truth. It has no effectiveness whatever in deciding a law of science. Every person in this room may vote against the law of gravitation and decide that it is either bad or non-existent, but let anyone of this overwhelming majority step out from a fifteenth-story window and the law of gravitation asserts itself. English admirers of the parliamentary system were wont to assert that the English parliament could do anything except revoke a law of nature. Democracy has at least as many

limitations as the all-powerful parliament so praised by its admirers. Similarly, every person in this audience might vote that the popular crooner of the day is a greater musician than Beethoven; but unless the popular crooner of the day produces his music in accordance with fundamental laws of harmony and beauty, Beethoven will be remembered long after the crooning is forgotten. So, Shakespeare or any other great artist, whatever his medium of expression, is great not because there was ever a counting of noses, but because he works so in harmony with the fundamental laws of his art that his art compels acceptance. Similarly, there is fundamental law in the realm of ethics and morality. Hitler may be able to cast the votes of one hundred million Germans, and Stalin may count the votes of the uncounted millions of Russians. And they may draw to their side many Americans and others who think that the might of numbers makes right; but murder will remain murder, not because there is a law against it passed by a majority vote, but because murder is fundamentally contrary to the ethical and moral principles in accord with which human beings must live.

It is an odd fact that we have listened to superficial philosophers who have denied that there is any moral law—any fundamental principle of right and wrong—to govern the association of human beings, at the same time that these same philosophers have been glorifying the compelling force of natural law. They call a man a fool who refuses to see the law of gravitation and heed it, and in the same breath praise him for refusing to admit any fundamental moral or ethical law. They proclaim that morals are simply manners or conventions formally or informally agreed upon or found practical. And they make much the same claim as to art and beauty. For my part, I would have presented to the children of democracy the idea that nature, man, and beauty are all subject to law. We do not make the laws of nature either as one man or as many men. We can but discover them by using our best wits, and one man alone, if he is a Newton or a Pasteur or an Edison, can place all mankind in debt to him. We do not make the laws of beauty either by individual pronouncement or by majority vote. One man alone, if he is a Plato, may discover principles of beauty, or if he is a Raphael or a Beethoven or a Shakespeare, may so express beauty as to open the eyes of all who come after. No man alone by pronouncement or by leading a whirlwind campaign at the polls can create right and wrong, but one man alone if he is a Buddha leaving his father's kingly castle to share the sorrows of men, or a Socrates awaiting the hemlock rather than be untrue to the spirit of God he has discovered within him, or a Jesus deserted in Gethsemane may with divine insight so see the laws of God that mankind must ever after live in accordance with them or be conscious of breaking them. If democracy is to endure, its children must carry over into the aesthetic and ethical realms the humility and respect for law they have been taught so well with reference to the wonders of nature.

Similarly, education has a responsibility to democracy of stressing once more the ascendancy of the human and the social, even to the point of stressing the divine element in both, over the purely natural. I have just said that our problem is to carry over into the aesthetic and the ethical the respect for fundamental law that we have for natural science. The trouble is that we have on a most material point misunderstood science. There is almost an element of pathos in the absoluteness with which we accept whatever is declared to be the law of science, because we have combined with our respect for scientific law such an idolatrous devotion to the so-called scientific method. The scientific method to many people means going into the laboratory and weighing and measuring until by a multitude of verifications we feel justified in stating that certain elements under certain conditions will always act and react in a certain way. This is the way we learn our science in high school and college, and it is a very good way. Incidentally, it is good for the instructor to set the experiments and control them if he does not wish to see his students and buildings blown to pieces, but this is not by any means the important thing about scientific method. Isaac Newton could have been bombarded with apples all his life without ever learning the law of gravitation. What Newton did fundamentally, when the celebrated apple hit him on the head, was to have a flash of insight. The insight was more important than the verifications Newton and anyone else have made. Pasteur, perhaps the best loved of all the scientists, and perhaps most typically exemplifying the popular notion of scientific method, was great primarily because of his *insight* into the causes of diseases. His experiments and verifications became mere hack work to follow up his brilliant insight. It is all right to stress the importance of methodical experimentation and verification. We have done a good job in training technicians in this way, but the fundamental discoveries of science are still made more often in one of two ways—by pure accident (provided there is a thinking man present when the accident occurs) and by the brilliant intuition or insight of the Newton and the Pasteur. If Education is to point out to the children of Democracy that the fundamental method of science is not weighing and measuring, whether haphazard or methodical, but that the laws of science are in the last analysis based upon *insight*, then we have laid a sound foundation of respect for aesthetic, political, and ethical insight and for the fundamental nature of law in all fields. Then the children of Democracy can see that changing fads called "art" (because they involve the "self-expression" so peculiarly important to many psychiatric individuals, as well as in some degree desirable for normal individuals) are not artistic at all in the true sense. They can also see that they are not retrogressing into the eighteenth century or the "horse-and-buggy" days when they accept the theories of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States that no majority, however great, can rightfully

deprive the individual of certain liberties. They can reject the English theory of an all-powerful king or executive, and insist upon the desirability of having duly constituted courts sworn to justice based upon the rights of even unpopular individuals threatened by popular laws. They can even see that as citizens they must at times vote against their immediate self-interest and selfish desires, if democracy is to endure.

Education, in short, has not done its duty to Democracy until having brought the child all the information and knowledge it can, and having taught him all the respect for law it can, it says to him, "Use all these as mere tools, but the insight you have as a human being is far more precious than any mere routine in which you can engage; and the insights other men have had into fundamental law are so precious that you have definite responsibility to try them and classify them and build upon them until all the little laws man has age after age extracted from the Body of Law underlying this universe have grown into the consciousness of all men."

## The November Issue of the Quarterly

The November issue, besides carrying the program for the annual meeting, December 9-13, and the open forum announced on the preceding pages of these editorial notes, will again carry the "historical" section. In this section the following types of articles are desired:

1. A complete write-up of any of the early meetings of the Southern Association, including the outstanding personalities and problems, a sketch of the program, and the constructive work done. For this issue, we should prefer articles dealing with the meetings of the Association held prior to 1920;

2. A complete write-up of the work of the Commission on Secondary Schools prior to the close of its twelfth annual meeting in 1923;

3. A complete write-up of the work of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education prior to the close of its seventh meeting in 1923;

4. A write-up of the development of the secondary school division of the state department of education in each of the states of the Southern Association. This write-up should include a statement of conditions in public secondary schools in the state prior to 1905 or 1910, including, if possible, the number of high schools and the number of students in the graduating classes, the names of supervisory officials, beginning with the first of the high school inspectors or other such officials appointed to supervisory offices in the secondary school system, and such other developments within the secondary schools as the writer deems outstanding;

5. The growth of coöperation among the higher institutions of the state, exemplified by such organizations as college conferences;

6. A survey of the development of private secondary schools within a

given state including changes in curriculum, development of coöperations, etc. The history of a single institution, public or private, if so written as to show typical changes in standards, curriculum, and the like, might be entirely acceptable, provided the author does not object to the editor eliminating what outsiders might interpret as institutional advertising;

7. The development of higher education, starting in 1895, within a given state, including the rise of new institutions, changes in standards and curriculum, development of coöperation, etc. Such an article might be limited to some one type of institution such as denominational colleges, state institutions, teachers' colleges, etc. The history of a single institution might prove to be an entirely acceptable article, if presented as representative of typical developments rather than a glorification of the individual institution;

8. The growth of an institution during the administration of some outstanding administrator now dead, particularly as treated from the standpoint of general Southern educational development along with the contribution of the individual and the development of his institution.

Examples of the types of articles desired will be found in the November issue of 1937, Volume I, Number 4, of the SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, and in the corresponding numbers for 1938 and 1939.

If you wish to contribute such an article, write the QUARTERLY at once your good intentions; and if by any chance, some one else has already taken your precise subject—a very remote contingency, in most cases—we shall let you know.

## Builders of the Southern Association

"Builders of the Southern Association" will be continued in the issue for November, 1940. Previous lists of those who have served as many as twenty-five years in some member college or school will be found in the issues of February and November, 1938 (see pages 47-83 and 475-479, Volume II), February, 1939 (see pages 107-156, Volume III), and February, 1940 (see pages 82-99, Volume IV). Of course it is not the intention of the QUARTERLY to publish in the February list names already printed in these preceding lists.

Please use the following form if you need more blanks than have been mailed to you:

RECORD OF FACULTY MEMBER OR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL WHO HAS SERVED TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OR MORE IN.....

.....

(Here insert name of university, college, or secondary school. Furnish data for employee of faculty standing only.)

Name of the employee.....

Academic degrees held, with name of institutions conferring them in each case.....

Institutions at which employee has pursued further studies during period of his employment.....

(If employee has taken time out for further study, even without leave from your institution, but returned upon completing his period of study, count his service as continuous for purposes of this report.)

Different positions he has held in your institution or system and length of time in each .....

.....

.....

(Public high schools will include in this report their superintendent and other supervisory officials, provided of course such officials have served twenty-five years, even though part of the service of such persons was in some other part of the school system, e.g., an elementary principalship or teaching position. The high school should today be stronger for having on its present staff persons of long service and devotion to the system.)

Date at which service of employee began.....

Present position and when entered.....

Any distinct, or most important, contribution(s) to the institution.....

.....

Additional information that to you seems pertinent.....

.....

## In Memoriam

"In Memoriam" will be continued from February, 1940, in the November, 1940, issue. Please use the following form for this list:

RECORD OF FACULTY MEMBER OR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICIAL WHO HAS DIED SINCE JANUARY 1 IN THE SERVICE OF.....

.....

(Here insert name of your institution.)

Name of employee.....

Academic degrees, if any, with name of institutions conferring them....

.....

Date employment began in your institution.....

Position held.....

Date of death.....

Any distinct contribution of deceased to your institution.....

.....

Additional information that to you seems pertinent.....

.....

## Correction

The enrollment for Jefferson High School, Jefferson, Texas, was listed as 81 instead of 305 in the May, 1940, QUARTERLY. In all modesty, Principal Stark requests that correction be made. With a teaching faculty of 15, he declines to accept such reduction in pupil-teacher ratio as would make him the envy of nearly all the other members of the Southern Association.

## SAM B. HATHORN

Sam B. Hathorn, Director of Instruction, Mississippi State College, since 1936, and member of the Executive Committee of the Southern Association since 1938, died within a week after his return home from the Atlanta meeting. He had been active in the affairs of the Association for more than ten years, having entered into official relationship as a member of the Secondary Commission in 1929, when he was State High School Supervisor in Mississippi. Except for one year he continued as a member of the Commission until his death, and was chairman in 1935, presiding over the Louisville meeting of the Commission.

He was easily one of the best loved and most influential members of the Association. He enjoyed leadership because selection by his fellows to places of responsibility he frankly interpreted as expression of confidence and goodwill. Because he loved people, he never took extreme positions in controversy; and his influence was always on the side of compromise and goodwill. He earnestly strove to find out how far a majority could agree before taking action that would change what already existed, and he worked hard to find clear statement of parliamentary matters that would leave no doubt as to what an action meant after it should be adopted. Members of the Association who read the open forum discussions of last February will remember that his suggestions as to the matters then before the Association were admirable summaries of the moderate opinion presented in those discussions.

The Association in its councils will miss Sam Hathorn with his quiet friendliness and ability to understand the points of view of other people, his straightforward honesty, and his constructive desire to move away from an established position no more rapidly than a clear majority genuinely should desire.